Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2000

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2000-05-31 through 2000-06-04

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 250

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39358E4E.1E33445C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Steve Robeson wrote:
> >> HOW much was that IQ?
> > >
> > >Higher than 75% of the members of MENSA.
>
> What *is* the average IQ of a MENSA member?

Actually, IQ is not generally measured using a number any more
because there is more than one standard. The entry level IQ
for MENSA members is upper 2% of the general population. So
the IQ of the *average* MENSA member is something like the upper
1.5% of the general population. It would be whatever is the
average of the upper 2% of the bell-shaped curve.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

2. Re: "Dirty Words": Hey Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <#7b3q#0y$GA.320@cpmsnbbsa07>
Source record: 2

General Mark Morgan wrote
>Hey Aaron, if you can read the subject line said Hey Larry, NOT hey
>Aaron. Please keep your comments to yourself...

Hey General, this is an *open newsgroup*. Please keep your comments to
yourself if you don't want a group response...

3. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39358FF2.CE19E3A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3

Steve Robeson wrote:
> The question was (and still is) WHAT reference did you use...?!?!

I am most familiar with motorcycle gangs, the overwhelming majority
of which are white. And, for the record, what I said is that I wouldn't
be surprised if the majority of gangs are white. I didn't ever claim
to have a reference.

> A published FBI statistic? Something from the Attorney General's office?
> Any recognized organized crime task force? ANYTHING that DOESN'T come from The
> Star or The Inquirer?

Obviously since you seem to know the answer you must have the
FBI statistics so why not just publish them. If you don't have
them, what does that say about your references?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4. Re: How Long for Post April 15th License Processing?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jerry Hooten <jhooten@freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <39358B54.4B20D647@freewwweb.com>
Source record: 4

Bill I checked the FCC database last night and my upgrade has been posted, I didn't take the FCC near as long as it took the arrl.

Jerry

5. Re: FCC TO DO AWAY WITH LICENSE REQUIREMENTS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h45lo$u0i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 5

In article <20000529125623.22354.00000413@ng-cv1.aol.com>,
mailfrmpa@aol.com (MailfrmPA) wrote:
> Word from insiders at FCC is that all technical AND cw requirements
for VHF and
> UHF licenses are soon to be eliminated!
>
> In their place will be Permission Slips, filled in and signed by
Parent or
> Legal Guardian, or other responsible Adult! Those without a
Permission Slip
> will not be allowed to go on the bands.
>
> Will HF be next??
>
> K&#65533;MB

Hmmm...There might be some truth in this rumor. Maybe it is but
wishful thinking on the part of the ARRL....especially those who can
only think of the number of Hams of any abilities that can be said to
make the hobby more popular.

BUT PLEASE THINK ABOUT: -
So far there is no more 20 wpm cw requirement for Extra, no more 13 wpm
requirement for General, and no more Novice, Tech Plus, or Advanced
Class.
When will the next shoes drop???
If trends continue there may well be no requirements for Tech license
privilages...and next no requirements for any ham privilages...and IMHO
this can only be expected to lead to no Ham Radio at all for anybody.

WE MUST REVERSE THE TREND. We must remember that there is a BASIS AND
PURPOSE FOR AMATEUR RADIO.

Hams need MORE technical license classes,
73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Ignore Licensing pessimisim?)

MEANS and ENDS
The gatekeeper in the capital city of Sung
became such an expert mourner after his father's
death, and so emaciated himself with fasts and
austerities, that he was promoted to high rank
in order that he might serve as a model of
ritual observance.
As a result of this, his imitators so deprived

themselves that half of them died. The others
were not promoted.
--Chuang Tzu--

Just the opposite of Tzu's means and ends...
The FCC has been the gatekeeper of Ham Radio...
but it is slowly opening that gate to all.
Who has promoted this dumbed down trend???
As a result of this trend half of the Real Hams
will be silent keys in a few years. The other
hams may be mainly imitator repeater clunkers.
They can not be Real Hams if they lose innovative
motivation, pioneering spirit, sporting curiosity,
and don't have any technical intrests in
common. Sadly there will be no higher Ham classes
to be promoted to. Sadly there will be no Ham Radio.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

6. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <393590B2.262596F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 6

Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: an article about manners in USA Today
> >From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 05/30/2000 11:29 PM Central Daylight Time
>
> >Steve it's neither/nor or either/or. Isn't/nor is a double negative.<
>
> Thanks for the English class, Cecil, but it still doesn't negate the fact
> that neither you OR Walter match the criteria you claim.

A B.S/M.E. degree, MENSA membership, and 45 years of experience
are not enough?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

7. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: Lenny-t <lenny-t@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <393592EF.2EE4@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 7
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Uh oh. He's ba-a-a-a-a-a-c-k.

-Lenny (Dwidler Extraordinaire)

Sycho_Graphics wrote:
>
> In short, WHO CARES. Let the ignorant, self-centered, egotistical basterds
> all go away so I don't have to hear about how great HAM was in 1960 one more
> damn time. I think they are a joke, cops think they are a joke, most local
> authorities (In real cities not shit towns) think they are a joke, anyone
> under the age of 30 thinks they are a joke, they are the only ones who seem
> to take themselves (way too) seriously. BYE, bye and good riddance.
>
> "me" <@.> wrote in message
> news:1BC5AB4B06B6F8D8.AAC0E5EAFC5FA110.82C6E091ECEFDFD2@lp.airnews.net...
> Funny. In 2 or so years there will be 200 hams.
> Those 200 hams will still think there are alot of hams.
> 1 HAM is one ego and a waste of time too many (CW). :)

--
"A greyhound needs no fanfare." - Jean Boone 1917-1998

8. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000531193506.10995.00000465@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 8

>Subject: Re: "Dirty Words"
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 05/31/2000 4:51 PM Central Daylight Time

>Such a statement probably falls under the simple assault laws in Texas and
self-defense is probably the result. To "end up" is pretty serious and final
stuff.<

Which only leads me to believe the stereotyped "country hick" is not such
a stereotype afterall.

Another graped-up post, me thinks.

Steve

9. Re: Behind the scenes in the Walker Household.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: ki7rw@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3935a2f2.2192382@news.scottsbluff.net>
Source record: 9

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

I love it!! :-D

On Wed, 31 May 2000 06:44:45 GMT, integrity@arrl.sucks.org (Wouff
Hong) wrote:

>
>Kim's Husband: Dinner was great tonight hon, was that a new recipe?
>
>TIT: No, I just kept your TV-Dinner in the microwave a bit longer
>this time.
>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: PGPfreeware 6.5.3 for non-commercial use <http://www.pgp.com>
Comment: Don't expect someone else to protect your privacy.

iQA/AwUBOTWjN4woPKBUx8xQEQLU8gCg1ZK62EondNpWKd+VxUoFrc0h3RcAoJxA
OkEUcprBAoPqtoJ+Wjk9Yjnu
=W3g9
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

10. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000531193740.10995.00000468@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 10

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 05/31/2000 5:12 PM Central Daylight Time

>It would be whatever is the average of the upper 2% of the bell-shaped curve.<

Damn...NOTHING is sacred...now even MENSA membership is subject to
"dumbing-down"...!!!

Membership on a curve...?!?! Wooohooo!!

Steve

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight
in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

11. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000531195239.10995.00000477@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 11

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 05/31/2000 5:19 PM Central Daylight Time

>Obviously since you seem to know the answer you must have the FBI statistics
so why not just publish them. If you don't have them, what does that say about
your references?<

I have several sources, Cecil, most of which are EMS related articles on
providing care in urban enviroments, especially where gang activity is rampant.
The footnotes quote several FBI, DoJ, ATF and LAPD studies.

Guess which three socioeconomic subgroups you are most likely to be
victimized in by a gang...?!?!

Even taking thier word on the matter with a huge grain of salt, I trust
thier opinions on the matter way before I do yours.

>If you don't have them, what does that say about your references?<

Journal of Emergency Medical Services of Solana Beach, CA

Emergency Medical Services magazine of Van Nuys, CA.

Journal Of the American Medical Association.

Journal of the American Association of Osteopathic Surgeons. (THE
organization that instituted EMS in the United States...they ARE the autorities
on trauma in the United States)

Fish or cut bait Cecil...just ADMIT you made your numbers up since it is
so overwelmingly apparent that you CANNOT substantiate your assertions.

You're busted, Cecil...more "King of the Mountain" assertions caught in
the light of day by truth and facts.

I am sure Mark and Lennie are proud to have you in thier company.

Steve

12. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000531195602.10995.00000479@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 12

>Subject: Re: an article about manners in USA Today
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 05/31/2000 5:22 PM Central Daylight Time

>A B.S/M.E. degree, MENSA membership, and 45 years of experience are not enough?<

Not when you can't validate your assertions with SOME documentable study on matters, Cecil.

Having been in engineering and with the credentials you claim, YOU of all people should know that an assertion made without some reference of fact is nothing more than a prideful boast.

Nothing more.

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

13. Re: FCC TO DO AWAY WITH LICENSE REQUIREMENTS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <kriZ4.29$d5.36667@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 13

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:

>> Word from insiders at FCC is that all technical AND cw requirements
>> for VHF and UHF licenses are soon to be eliminated!

> Hmmm...There might be some truth in this rumor.

I think not. Surely you cannot believe it.

> Maybe it is but wishful thinking on the part of the ARRL....

I can say with certainty that the ARRL does not support such a proposal.

> especially those who can only think of the number of Hams of
> any abilities that can be said to make the hobby more popular.

Can you say with any certainty just who this "those" is? A name or two
might be more convincing than a vague and unprovable accusation.

> So far there is no more 20 wpm cw requirement for Extra, no more 13 wpm
> requirement for General, and no more Novice, Tech Plus, or Advanced
> Class.

> When will the next shoes drop???

Okay, I give up. What it the date and nature of the next change you expect
to see in ham radio. On what do you base your estimate of the date and the
specifics of the change?

> If trends continue there may well be no requirements for Tech license
> privilages...and next no requirements for any ham privilages...and IMHO
> this can only be expected to lead to no Ham Radio at all for anybody.

Eliminating a requirement that no longer serves the same purpose it served
when it was introduced in the early part of the last century is not a
"trend." On second thought, maybe it is -- one that hopefully could
indicate that amateur radio might once again get in touch with modern radio
technology. Is this what you are suggesting should be happening?

> As a result of this trend half of the Real Hams
> will be silent keys in a few years.

Do you really think that the changes in the Morse code testing will increase
the death rate of Amateurs?

> They can not be Real Hams if they lose innovative
> motivation, pioneering spirit, sporting curiosity,
> and don't have any technical intrests in
> common.

And there are some who offer that eliminating a Morse code test will indeed result in some hams focusing their attention to "pioneering spirit." Most of the pioneering I can envision does not include OOK CW.

> Sadly there will be no higher Ham classes to be promoted to.

I guess that hams will have to promote themselves with accomplishments, much like Larry Roll's learning to fly model R/C airplanes.

> Sadly there will be no Ham Radio.

Another unprovable assertation. However, we can put a small wager on its being around at the end of 2009; would that be a reasonable time frame over which to speculate?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

14. Re: Ham radio's downward trend: Attn Steve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: "radiosigs@mindspring.com" <radiosigs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8h4c8i$sb3$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 14
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

To the "gentleman" who just disparaged Pres. Clinton, I have news for you. His influenece in the recent normalization of trade with China bill which should be passed by the Senate despite a moron like Jesse Helms will prove to be one of the most important pieces of INTELLIGENT legislation to ever come down from Capitol Hill. Why?
BECAUSE IT'S ALL ABOUT OIL! That's right, OIL. Forget the rest of the stuff you've heard about what China will give us and vice versa---that country has GREATER oil reserves than all the OPECKERS combined!
The standard networks don't talk about it and neither do the WWCR and Genesis Network crowd but I got wind of it from my cousin Sidney who's a spy and that's the REAL REASON why we have cozied up to Red China and if Taiwan doesn't like it, that's too bad because that place is just an island which is a nothing.
As a way of saying thanks to Clinton, the Chinese Prime Minister "Red Fat Hung" will allow us to go in there and DRILL and buy at prices much much lower than that of OPEC's. It will have a fantastic effect on our economy which President Al Gore will exploit to the fullest.
And youse guys are so concerned with ham radio and the ARRL? As far as I'm concerned, the ARRL SOLD US OUT-it's as plain and simple as that and I ended my membership until the dues drop to $14.95/year. My suggestion is THINK CHINA! Visit Chinese restaurants more often. Overdose on MSG. Bring in more shirts. Throw out your silverware and buy chopsticks.
The sleeping giant in the far east will awaken with our help and emerge as the major global power in the 21st century and if you think she's going to nuke us, you're nuts. Once she sees all those Yankee greenbacks pouring into her economy and all the coolies going from pulling rickshaws to driving BMWs, her oil will drive that OPEC scam out of business. In fact the Israelis will sense a good deal and offer to buy their crude for $3 a barrel.
Oy vey what a day it'll be when China influences America so much that our school kids will learn to read "My Dog Spot" from top to bottom instead of from left to right.
There's a Chinaman in Clifton who went to jail for constantly peking into windows.
AF2Y, Doc

In article <39352123.3663DE16@ahole.com>, General Mark Morgan <one.big.asshole@ahole.com> wrote:

> And what did your president, Bill Clinton ' do? Did he not send
> troops to do battle for 'oil'?
>
> "Steve - KF2TI/AE (Landing, NJ)" wrote:

>>
>> In article <8h1rav$9vn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, p1415926535@yahoo.com says...
>> > In article <delW4.21042$S31.454241@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
>> > "zincplaterubberant" <kru7dso@cir43a.org> wrote:
>> > [...]
>> > > While you are correct on your above observation, the greater
>> > > reason is our years and years of hanging onto an outdated
>> > > mode called CW. Today the American Retentive Radio Luddites
>> > > are running scared. Their membership is truly dying off
>> > > to the tune of an average of 55 US hams per month. Don't believe
>> > > this? Go to the library or your stacks of QST and check the
>> > > numbers in the SK listings for the past 8-12 months.
>> > >
>> >
>> > Only 55 US hams die per month? No, I don't believe that.
>> >
>> > Considering that the current US ham population is several
>> > hundred thousand (what is it now, about 600,000?), if the
>> > statistics for hams is similar to the general population there
>> > should be several times that many dying per month.
>> >
>> > Or did you just mean ARRL members? That number still sounds
>> > too low.
>> >
>> > OTOH, if hams only die at the rate of 55/month we could promote
>> > amateur radio just on its health benefits. :-)
>>
>> And they just reported that WWII aged veterans were dying at a rate of
>> 1000 per week and the national cemeteries are filling up. Guess the Army
>> and the ARS are both bad bets. Wonder how scared the VFW is (using the
>> same logic as the original poster) about their decreasing numbers.
>>
>> Maybe if we had a few more wars, they could promote and increase
>> membership???
>>
>> Who knows, if G. W is elected, he could send a few 100k to the middle
>> east just like his old man, so that the Tx Oil Barons can keep their
>> restrictive club memberships current.
>>
>> DX= FCC rules DO NOT prohibit the inclusion of any
>> type of reimbursement for postage, nor does it make
>> illegal any voluntary donation that the sender wishes
>> to include
>>
>> Repeaters= The FCC recognizes the right of individuals
>> and organizations to maintain close repeaters and
>> DOES NOT make it a crime to allow cited examples from
>> collecting monetary funds to maintain these operations

15. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <FwiZ4.30$d5.37035@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 15
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jeff Pierce <piercej@preferred.com> wrote:

> <ARRL> now caters to the equipment manufacturers for advertising dollars.

According to the ARRL's annual reports, the advertising revenues are a distant third to dues and publications sales. In the June issue of QST, less than half of the ad space was for actual manufacturers.

Can you offer some examples of actions that ARRL has taken that you feel have been to the benefit of equipment manufacturers without being a benefit to Amateur Radio.

> My view is that it is a now a publishing house that also lobby's for it's
> publishing's area of interest on the side.

Can you explain where you believe this "lobbying" takes place? I didn't see anything in any FCC filing that lobbied for ARRL publications.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

16. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MAiZ4.32$d5.37174@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 16
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

T.L. Bryant <tlbryant@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Maybe at one time, but the last time I was at AES in Cleveland, about 80%
of
> the books were ARRL publications. Looks like a monopoly to me.

Last time I went past Rosewood's table at a convention, about 40% of the
books looked like ARRL books. Maybe AES stocks the ones that sell the best.
:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

17. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <lziZ4.31$d5.37082@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 17
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

T.L. Bryant <tlbryant@my-deja.com> wrote:

> I'd personally take it a step further, to say that the ARRL has a monopoly
on
> the amateur radio publishing market. However, I doubt that the government
will
> go after them the way they have with Microsoft.

Please take a look at the results of a search of the ARRL TIS database at:

http://www.arrl.org/cgi-bin/tisfind?case=on&patt=PUBLICATION%3eBOOK

then explain how a monopoly can have so much competition. And ARRL is even
promoting those companies by including them in its database.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

18. Re: stamp design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <wQiZ4.33$d5.37336@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 18

Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

> > > Lastly, encourage your BoD to send out questionaires canvasing their
> > > constituents on various upcoming issues.

> > My director has done so on a number of occasions.

> > Polling is NOT the best way to get member input, IMHO; issues are best
> > solved by those who have more vested interest than checking off a box on
a
> > question they may or may not fully understand or may or may not be very
> > interested in.

> First, I think that a Director that cannot formulate an important
> issue or problem with ham radio, showing various facits of it, so that
> his constituents can understand it, is not much of a leader.

Actually, Clay, if you think about it a bit, there are a LOT of "burning issues" in ham radio. These are generally well documented in the ARRL Letter, the Web Extra and QST. I think that expecting a Director to reiterate all that info in a periodic newsletter is not a realistic expectation.

But let's put your assertation to the test; ARRL has documented the issues with wireless modem jacks very well, on its web pages, in the ARRL Letter, in the Web Extra and in QST. I know you CAN understand the issues, but do you? I can hardly think of something explained better, but I bet that only a relatively small percentage of hams have followed it from start to finish. Who could better set ARRL policy on that matter, those that have taken it upon themselves to be fully informed, or those who have not read the info as published? Would this matter really be best resolved by a poll of members, of resolved by HQ staff who have devoted hundreds of hours to studying the issue and working with the manufacturers, the FCC and the ARRL Board?

> Second, I think that there are too few directors. Our division covers
> two call areas. While I was a member of ARRL, I don't recall getting
> any info from a director except when time for election or reelection.
> What are the rules for increasing the number of directors?

The number of Directors is set in the ARRL bylaws. These can be modified by the ARRL Board of Directors. Each Director represents some 10k+- members, although Division sizes do vary. Most of the Directors also appoint Assistant Directors, although these are probably more accurately described as "Assistants to the Director." Only the Directors vote on ARRL policy. If you feel that the number of Directors should be changed, discuss this with your Director. Do consider, though, that there are direct costs to each Directorship, with travel expenses to and fro Board meetings and travel

within a Division. This probably doesn't affect you much, because you have stated that you are no longer an ARRL member, but those who are footing the bills may hold opinions contrary to yours about how many Directors the membership should fund. BTW, speaking of funds, I will make sure that I haven't caused any misunderstanding; ARRL Directors and most officers receive no salary compensation -- only reimbursement for authorized expenses.

Some of the gap is made up by the ARRL Section Managers, who are elected people managing the ARRL Field Organization in their sections.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

19. Re: Behind the scenes in the Walker Household.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <EC99CE247A96B9FF.60BB619FCA0CA36A.B11CAAD7FA659D7F@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 19

```
Me too!!

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Lee Roberts" <ki7rw@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3935a2f2.2192382@news.scottsbluff.net...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> I love it!! :-D
>
> On Wed, 31 May 2000 06:44:45 GMT, integrity@arrl.sucks.org (Wouff
> Hong) wrote:
>
> >
> >Kim's Husband: Dinner was great tonight hon, was that a new recipe?
> >
> >TIT: No, I just kept your TV-Dinner in the microwave a bit longer
> >this time.
> >
>
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: PGPfreeware 6.5.3 for non-commercial use <http://www.pgp.com>
> Comment: Don't expect someone else to protect your privacy.
>
> iQA/AwUBOTWjN4woPKBUx8xQEQLU8gCg1ZK62EondNpWKd+VxUoFrc0h3RcAoJxA
> OkEUcprBAoPqtoJ+Wjk9Yjnu
> =W3g9
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>
```

20. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <82743FAA4A4B61B4.EF15427283FDF0EC.ADD484E121A17043@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 20

Ummmm, Larry. My husband *is* my soulmate... :)

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20000531112900.10818.00005936@nso-fi.aol.com...
> In article <20000531004706.29970.00000747@ng-fu1.aol.com>,
> kk7ho@aol.communicate (KK7HO) writes:
>
> >
> >I think it's a great callsign Kim if it doesn't bother you, hell why not
have
> >a
> >fun callsign? I may have gotten in a little late on this but, I think
this
> >is
> >the first i've "ever" heard of that the word "tit" is offending to any
man. ?
> >
> > ROFLMAO .
> >
>
> Kim:
>
> There he is, your soulmate! Please be gentle when you break the
> news to your husband!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

21. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3DDCB1136890269A.3BB05C20C3021871.040E39D84B909E2E@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 21

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20000531220326.22842.00000062@nso-mf.aol.com...
>
> It didn't go over my head at all. I just don't accept it as the only
reason,
> because your other statements contradict that. Ayn Rand says that true
> contradictions do not exist in reality. When an apparent contradiction is
> found, one should check one's premises, because at least one of them is
wrong.
> That's what I'm doing.
>

I don't think there's a contradiction. There's a difference of opinion. If
I say a tree *is* making noise in the woods, even if nothing is around to
hear it; you might say it does not. That is not a contradiction. It is a
difference of opinion.

>
> All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the answers, in
an
> effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their reasoning.
If
> their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.
>

I am near certain you aren't interested in other peoples' opinions. I am
absolutely certain I am not interested in yours.

Kim W5TIT

22. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3935D3B4.81960751@IEEE.org>
Source record: 22

Steve Robeson wrote:
> Membership on a curve...?!?! Wooohooo!!

It's pretty hard for a non-member of MENSA to understand, Steve.
The area under the upper 2% of the bell-shaped curve does not
average out to 1%.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

23. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3935D49D.A8CCA4FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 23

Steve Robeson wrote:
> You're busted, Cecil...more "King of the Mountain" assertions caught in
> the light of day by truth and facts.

All I did was state my opinion based on my experiences, Steve. I ride
a motorcycle so I am exposed primarily to motorcycle gangs. What
percentage of motorcycle gangs are white? I said I wouldn't be
surprised if the majority of gangs were white. I still would not
be surprised if the majority of gangs were white.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

24. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-05-31 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3935D635.D07C7F1B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 24

Steve Robeson wrote:
> Not when you can't validate your assertions with SOME documentable study
> on matters, Cecil.

I didn't make any assertions, Steve. I said I wouldn't be surprised
if the majority of gangs are white. I still wouldn't be surprised
if the majority of gangs are white. That's NOT an assertion that
the majority of gangs are white. Why do you make false statements?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

25. Re: How Long for Post April 15th License Processing?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000531200224.10995.00000482@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 25

>Subject: Re: How Long for Post April 15th License Processing?
>From: Jerry Hooten jhooten@freewwweb.com
>Date: 05/31/2000 4:59 PM Central Daylight Time

>Bill I checked the FCC database last night and my upgrade has been posted, I didn't take the FCC near as long as it took the arrl.<

How soon they forget.

There were occassions where FCC processing took as much as 2 months. Of course that's when the FCC did the testing, correlated the paperwork, forwarded it to Gettysburg, and THEN Gettysburg took thier time with it.

In as much as the FCC put the onus of responsibility on the VEC's to reorganize all the tests, make new ones, conduct the tests and then forward the paperwork to Gettysburg, I don't think four to six weeks to implement a new programis such a big problem.

The only people who were really affected were NEW licensee's. Upgraders had immediate access.

73

Steve

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

26. Re: stamp design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3935B1A3.18FC@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 26

Ed Hare, W1RFI wrote:
>
> Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
> > Lastly, encourage your BoD to send out questionaires canvasing their
> > constituents on various upcoming issues.
>
> My director has done so on a number of occasions.
>
> Polling is NOT the best way to get member input, IMHO; issues are best
> solved by those who have more vested interest than checking off a box on a
> question they may or may not fully understand or may or may not be very
> interested in.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hi Ed,
First, I think that a Director that cannot formulate an important
issue or problem with ham radio, showing various facits of it, so that
his constituents can understand it, is not much of a leader.

Second, I think that there are too few directors. Our division covers
two call areas. While I was a member of ARRL, I don't recall getting
any info from a director except when time for election or reelection.
What are the rules for increasing the number of directors?

73,
Clay N4AOX

27. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <8h4d1h$2cl$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 27
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve - KF2TI/AE (Landing, NJ) <kf2ti@interactive.net> wrote:
>And they just reported that WWII aged veterans were dying at a rate of
>1000 per week and the national cemeteries are filling up.

Steve, that figure is 1000 per DAY!!

Jeff

28. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000531220326.22842.00000062@nso-mf.aol.com>
Source record: 28

In article <F6897F61574458A6.732F4750847CB822.72E9618F80865852@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20000531060839.15983.00001691@nso-fk.aol.com...
>> In article
><AF7C9C99A3833910.243B486801B9C24F.EEE87F0AB70F2641@lp.airnews.net>,
>> "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:
>>
>> >> Your call is obviously of the latter category. You've told us why you
>> >chose it.
>> >> You knew that it's common ham practice to separate the suffix in
>vanity
>> >> callsigns. You've also said you wouldn't utter the word formed from the
>> >suffix
>> >> on the air.
>> >
>> >You assume an awful lot.
>>
>> I don't assume a thing in the above. You've told us everything contained
>in
>> those three sentences of mine right here on rrap in the past week or so.
>
>Where have I said anything about using a suffix as a name?

When you said you knew a fellow nicknamed "len" who'd done just that.

Nowhere in those three quoted sentences do I say you knew about using a suffix
as a name. Rather, the custom has been to separate the suffix as a WORD, or
abbreviation. That you knew this is obvious because otherwise you wouldn't have
chosen the suffix that you did.
>
>> >I don't know anyone, anyone at all, that uses
>> >their suffix as a name?! Do you?
>>
>> Sure. It's an old custom. Just because you don't know of something doesn't
>mean
>> it doesn't exist.
>
>I believe your statement, *was* Jim, that I *KNEW* that was a "common ham
>practice."

To look at the suffix as a separate word surely is.

> Don't pull your crap.
>

Why the profanity?
>>
>> Then why choose the call you did?
>
>Well, since it's your statement that I've explained all that, and since you
>still don't get it; my repeating it another time for your benefit will
>probably go over your head again.

It didn't go over my head at all. I just don't accept it as the only reason, because your other statements contradict that. Ayn Rand says that true contradictions do not exist in reality. When an apparent contradiction is found, one should check one's premises, because at least one of them is wrong. That's what I'm doing.
>
>> Sure you did. You've said so right here in rrap. Now you're backpedaling.
>
>Doesn't that make a great buzz word?

Just the simple truth.

> If you believe that, I have no ounce
>of indifference to your belief.

I have no idea what "I have no ounce of indifference" means.
>
> >> Why not? Do you think it's OK to have the word in your callsign, but
>not
>> >have a
>> >> discussion about same?
>> >
>> >Obviously, yes.
>>
>> Seems hypocritical to me. Double standard. All talk and no action.
>
>Once again, *your* opinion, Jim. Not mine.

Of course. I'm just commenting on an apparent contradiction. Is that not allowed on rrap?

> Why do you insist on asking a
>question, then stating an objection (that was obviously going to be issued)
>to the answer? That is so weird.

No, it's a time-honored method of inquiry. It's called the Socratic method. Questions are asked, and comments made on the responses.

All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the answers, in an effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their reasoning. If their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.

> Could you not state what you believe
>without comment from me?

Were I to state what I think, I'm pretty sure you'd have plenty of comment.

> Weird.....

Not at all. The method dates back thousands of years.
>
>> >And, Jim, you don't have to if you don't want to.
>>
>> I simply know better. I was a kid once.
>
>Oh, and I was not.

Did I say that? Nope.

> Now, you're the one with the only, the most, the largest
>experience over every other past kid.

Did I say that? Nope.

You presented a scenario where you claim to know what a kid would understand and not understand. Sounds like you were presenting yourself as the definitive authority on the subject. My experience is simply different than yours. Why are you so threatened by that?

> Okie dokie....<G>
>
Then you agree.

>> > *If* there is a kid
>> >sitting there who picks up on what the hell we are talking about...it
>isn't
>> >because *I* taught them anything.
>>
>> So that lets you off the hook? Nope. You ARE teaching them something, by
>having
>> such a conversation in their presence.
>>
>> I knew all of the "dirty" words, and what they meant, by the time I was
>ten or
>> so. Also knew that they were NOT to be used in most situations - by the
>example
>> set by the adults around me.
>
><SHRUG> Your experience, not mine.

That's all I'm saying.

> K?

I have no idea what the single letter "K" is supposed to mean in this context.
>
>> > And, if they pick up on it, understand
>> >it, and see that we can have fun with it, I personally believe this is a
>> >healthier kid.
>>

>> I don't.
>
><SHRUG> Your opinion, not mine. K?

I have no idea what the single letter "K" is supposed to mean in this context.
>> >
>> >And I maintain that those peoples' problems are not my concern. I cannot
>> >convince a naysayer of anything more than they wish to believe in.
>>
>> In other words, you want to do what you want to do and to (expletive
>deleted)
>> with everybody else. That sort of attitude is a prime reason for the slow
>> erosion of social values, and the rise of things like CC&Rs.
>
>In some cases, yeah, Jim.

Fine - we agree on something.

> I don't just "want" to do what I want to do. I *DO* it.

That's even worse. Let me rephrase:

In other words, you DO what you want to do and to (expletive deleted) with
everybody else. That sort of attitude is a prime reason for the slow erosion of
social values, and the rise of things like CC&Rs.
>
>And, if you wish me to be the erosion of social values,

Whoa there. I did NOT say YOU. I said "that attitude".

> and the
>rise of things like CC&Rs (Bwahhahhaaa), you just carry your happy little
>butt off to lala land and be happy... Because I know different.

You "know different"? How? Show us some proof.

One of the reasons for the rise of things like CC&Rs, and their widespread
acceptance is the fact that many people simply don't trust their neighbors to
be good neighbors, and behave in a community-spirited way. So all sorts of
details are codified into deed restrictions and covenants that are practically
impossible to change, so people will be contractually bound to behave in
certain ways. like keeping their grass cut, their houses painted and in good
repair, etc. Ask Aaron Jones - he's seen it first hand.

The erosion of social values comes directly from people's obsession with their
"rights" but not the associated responsibilities. They want freedom to do what
they want, but don't want to consider the effects of their actions on others.
The person who says "if my behavior bothers you, that's YOUR problem" is a good
example of this.

>(To use
>someone else's science, *ahem*)

Give us some proof, please.
>>
>> >This topic is not all about just you, Jim.
>>
>> It seems you want it to be all about YOU, Kim.
>
>Ah, so you agree.

You prove my point for me. Thank YOU.

>Thank you. You asked (questions) for dialogue (requiring
>answers), I responded.

Yup.

>You didn't like the answers.

I see apparent contradictions in the answers, and point them out. Also point
out the effects of those answers.

> Can't say I wasn't truthful. Can't say

Have I EVER posted that someone was lying? Nope. You can check it in deja.
>
>> >There's been several people who are actually participating and many,
>> >many more who simply read.
>>
>> So? You can make your statements, but I cannot clarify them?
>
>Wait, now *YOU'RE* going to clarify my statements?

Yup. By pointing out contradictions, as noted above.

> You so funny.
>

Thank you.

>> >Your opinion.
>>
>> No, simple fact.
>
>Lookit you.You can have your opinions...I *know* different.

Then give us some proof. I have.

>(That's
>feeling pretty good right about now...thanks for that line, Jim.)

You have to back it up, though.
>> >
>> >It means that my callsign, nor my willingness to have it, has anything to
>do
>> >with me being sexually suggestive, lude, obscene, etc.
>>
>> Methinks you doth protest too much.

>
>Yuh, and you are the veritable dreamer, eh?

Nope. Just noting that you deny things nobody here has accused you of.
>>
>> > You are a sick puppy.
>>
>> Why am I "sick" because I ask for clarification of a subject YOU brought
>up?
>
>OK, here's the clarification thing again. Jim, you don't need clarification
>of a thing from me.

I don't need anything from you, Kim.

> You already have your opinions, and I could write 'til
>my fingers bled at the tips without changing your mind,

Why do you want to change my mind? You haven't even asked what I think - you
just assume you know.

> allowing for any
>kind of understanding, etc.

I understand a lot. I think that's what bothers you the most.

>You play innocent by saying you need clarification.

I don't need anyhting from you, Kim. The question I asked was:

"Why am I "sick" because I ask for clarification of a subject YOU brought up?"

>Like I said, you so funny.

A slick way to avoid answering a simple question.
>
>> >> Would you rather go back 40-50 years to when people "knew their place"
>and
>> >> didn't get "uppity"?
>> >
>> >Excuse me?
>>
>> In other posts, you've expressed regret that manners are not what they
>used to
>> be. Your attitude towards my innocent questions indicates you consider me
>> "uppity".
>
>There ya go! That's what the "excuse me" was for. We don't need to go back
>40-50 years ago....LOL
>> >
>> >Then quit asking questions.....
>>
>> So you would silence my free speech, but not your own. Double standard.
>>

>You so funny.

No, just stating the facts.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

29. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Peter Maus <PeterMaus@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3935D9E0.7499E107@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 29

Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
> >From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 05/31/2000 5:19 PM Central Daylight Time
>
> >Obviously since you seem to know the answer you must have the FBI statistics
> so why not just publish them. If you don't have them, what does that say about
> your references?<
>
> I have several sources, Cecil, most of which are EMS related articles on
> providing care in urban enviroments, especially where gang activity is rampant.
> The footnotes quote several FBI, DoJ, ATF and LAPD studies.
>
> Guess which three socioeconomic subgroups you are most likely to be
> victimized in by a gang...?!?!
>
> Even taking thier word on the matter with a huge grain of salt, I trust
> thier opinions on the matter way before I do yours.
>
> >If you don't have them, what does that say about your references?<
>
> Journal of Emergency Medical Services of Solana Beach, CA
>
> Emergency Medical Services magazine of Van Nuys, CA.
>
> Journal Of the American Medical Association.
>
> Journal of the American Association of Osteopathic Surgeons. (THE
> organization that instituted EMS in the United States...they ARE the autorities
> on trauma in the United States)
>
> Fish or cut bait Cecil...just ADMIT you made your numbers up since it is
> so overwelmingly apparent that you CANNOT substantiate your assertions.
>
> You're busted, Cecil...more "King of the Mountain" assertions caught in
> the light of day by truth and facts.
>
> I am sure Mark and Lennie are proud to have you in thier company.
>
> Steve

There is no faster way to guarantee the limitless life of a
thread on Usenet, than to say say "F*ck You" in Netspeak: Cite Your

Source.

At that instant the argument goes from topic to arguing the validity of the sources. So, experienced Netters, don't.

Personally, I invite individuals requiring statistics to look them up themselves, and verify at the same time the validity of the source.

But the real argument to be made in most cases is not in the debate of the minutiae of statistics, but in bigger pictures. Stepping back a level from the quantitative to the qualitative, produces a greater clarity of direction,and result. Often it the very numbers in an argument are the tool of obfuscation of either or both sides. Of course while the numbers never lie, the interpretations laid upon them do. Avoidance of the minutiae permits avoidance of misrepresentation of the numbers.

Recall that Clinton's strategy has always been to debate the tiniest of details in language, while avoiding discussion of the real issue of his truthfulness.

So it is with this discussion: Now involved in statistics of gang predation, instead of the issue of quality of life and liberty as the thread began.

It's an interesting thing to watch.

Just a thought.

30. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601004325.19467.00000429@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 30

In article <393590B2.262596F3@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>A B.S/M.E. degree, MENSA membership, and 45 years of experience
>are not enough?
>

Cecil:

If you're so smart, why aren't you a Post hole Digger?

73 de Larry, K3LT
AA Liberal Arts
AAS Computer Science
AAS Transportation Management
BS Human Resources Management, Summa Cum Laude
Member, Delta Epsilon Rho and Sigma Beta Delta Honor Societies
IQ: 156
MENSA: Wouldn't touch it with a 3-meter pole!

31. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601004326.19467.00000430@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 31

In article <3935894A.142FC874@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>Steve Robeson wrote:
>> You are, to say the VERY least, stretching for it on this one, Cecil.
>> Don't embarass yourself any further, it's really humiliating, you know.
>
>Steve, I realize that different parts of the country have different
>language characteristics. But if you walk up to the average adult
>male Texan and tell him that if he does 'X' he will "end up very
>deeply regretting it" you had better duck. Such a statement probably
>falls under the simple assault laws in Texas and self-defense is
>probably the result. To "end up" is pretty serious and final stuff.
>

Cecil:

Any Texan who utilized physical "self-defense" for something I said
to him verbally, would, indeed, "end up" very deeply regretting it!
And that's a copper-bottom promise, son!

BTW -- Whenever I've been in Texas, all the people I met were
polite, friendly, and considerate -- nothing like you or Kim!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Delaware: They don't call it "The First State" for nothing!

32. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601004326.19467.00000431@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 32

In article <39358A57.DF6C68C3@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> ROFLMAO!!! Thanks, Cecil, I haven't had that good a laugh
>> in several days, not even from Kim!
>
>You may be able to laugh up there in your little postage stamp
>sized yankee state but I would advise against coming to Texas and
>saying to a Texan that he is going to "end up very deeply regretting"
>something. That is definitely considered a threat down here. Criminals
>in Texas have been convicted of simple assault for less.
>

Cecil:

Izzat so? Well, if you come to Dover, just remember not to walk
down S. New St. or Capitol Park alone after sundown -- or you're
going to end up deeply regretting it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

33. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601004326.19467.00000432@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 33

In article <HUcZ4.23$d5.33043@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> Why the hell would I need some steenking gyro or an even more
>> steenking whiz-bang computer radio just to fly an R/C helicopter?
>> I'm a natural-born R/C pilot -- literally just picked up a transmitter
>> and started flying -- well!
>
>What's this? You didn't prove your skill at flying by taking a test first?
>Does that mean that your flying accomplishments are not valid? :-)
>

Ed:

Flying radio controlled model airplanes does not require a license.
The transmitters used to operate under Part 95 and required a CB
license, but that requirement has been dropped; we now have
about 50 channels in the 72 - 75 MHz region. Don't know all the
technical details because I've been away from it for years. And
whether or not my flying accomplishments are "valid" is something
I could care less about. If some sort of licensing and testing for
a license were necessary, I would just do whatever was necessary
to pass the tests, then keyboard-slam all the lazy whiners who
didn't want to learn something useful to pass the tests! Any
other questions?

73 de Larry, K3LT

34. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601004327.19467.00000433@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 34

In article <20000531162040.00132.00000867@ng-fu1.aol.com>,
kk7ho@aol.communicate (KK7HO) writes:

>
>You'll be OK Larry, one of these days. Just keep taking the Prozak as
>prescribed.
>

Prozak? What's that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

35. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601013412.10650.00000661@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 35

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: Peter Maus PeterMaus@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 05/31/2000 10:34 PM Central Daylight Time

>Personally, I invite individuals requiring statistics to look them up themselves, and verify at the same time the validity of the source<

I would have loved to, Peter, except Cecil refused (is still refusing) to cite his source to BE validated.

> So it is with this discussion: Now involved in statistics of gang predation, instead of the issue of quality of life and liberty as the thread began.<

Quality of life...in gang infested communities? Here is where you should back up and consider the QUANTITY of life.

>There is no faster way to guarantee the limitless life of a thread on Usenet, than to say say "F*ck You" in Netspeak: Cite Your Source.<

Thank you for your insight.

Are you kin to Miss Manners or Len Anderson?

Steve

36. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601012511.10650.00000658@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 36

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 05/31/2000 10:08 PM Central Daylight Time

>It's pretty hard for a non-member of MENSA to understand, Steve. The area under the upper 2% of the bell-shaped curve does not average out to 1%.<

You may find this hard to believe, Cecil. but it does not require a MENSA-leval IQ nor a degree in statistics to understand the workings of a bell curve.

And the percentage under that 2% doesn't impress me when the other 98% of that curve pulls that 2% closer to the middle.

Not very impressive.

37. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601020020.10650.00000669@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 37

>Subject: Re: an article about manners in USA Today
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 05/31/2000 10:19 PM Central Daylight Time

>I didn't make any assertions, Steve<

Yes you did.

>I said I wouldn't be surprised if the majority of gangs are white.<

That's NOT what you said, Cecil.

>I still wouldn't be surprised if the majority of gangs are white.<

That's because the scope of your experiences and knowledge are limited.

> That's NOT an assertion that the majority of gangs are white.<

Your original post was.

>Why do you make false statements?<

I haven't made one in this thread, Cecil. I HAVE called into question
YOUR assertion and asked you to validate it with some sort of facts.

Why do you engineer questions so as to be insulting and misleading when
you know such is not the case?

We used to call that a "cheap shot". VERY much below the character of a
person alleged to be a MENSA member or a fellow of the IEEE, isn't it?

You have tried to redirect from that comment since I called you on it
rather than just say "it was my opinion, not a fact". That would have been the
end of it.

Instead, you embarked on what some (one) would call an "obfuscation" of the
matter.

You have further tried to impress us with your education and alleged
membership in MENSA as if either had anything to do with the facts or the topic
at hand. Neither do.

As a matter of fact, I would expect that a person with those (alleged)
credentials would know how to do a bit of research and communicate the results
of same. You can't even state an opinion effectively.

"There are as many white gangs as there are black" (your initial comment)
is a statement, NOT an opinion.

"In my experience..." limits the statement to just that...YOUR experience.
It is fact, but limiting in nature to the limits of your experience.

Please try some accuracy, OK?

Steve

38. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601055031.15983.00001820@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 38

In article <3DDCB1136890269A.3BB05C20C3021871.040E39D84B909E2E@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20000531220326.22842.00000062@nso-mf.aol.com...
>>
>> It didn't go over my head at all. I just don't accept it as the only
>reason,
>> because your other statements contradict that. Ayn Rand says that true
>> contradictions do not exist in reality. When an apparent contradiction is
>> found, one should check one's premises, because at least one of them is
>wrong.
>> That's what I'm doing.
>
>I don't think there's a contradiction.

Of course you don't. That's why you don't like it when I point them out.

> There's a difference of opinion.

Lots of those. However everything is not just an opinion.

> If
>I say a tree *is* making noise in the woods, even if nothing is around to
>hear it; you might say it does not.

True.

>That is not a contradiction. It is a
>difference of opinion.

No, it's a contradiction. The thing to do is to check the premises - such as
"what is 'noise'?"
>>
>> All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the answers, in
>an
>> effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their reasoning.
>If
>> their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.
>>
>
>I am near certain you aren't interested in other peoples' opinions.

You are completely mistaken about that. I'm greatly interested in other
people's opinions. That does not mean I always agree with them or adopt them as
my own. I only do that when another's opinion is based on sound reasoning.

I'm even more interested in relevant facts, such as those posted by knowledgeable folks like Phil Kane.

>I am
>absolutely certain I am not interested in yours.

That's quite obvious. Your motives in posting here are quite different from mine. Just as your motives in callsign choice are different than mine.

It's interesting to note that you want to express an opinion about practically everything said here, and to examine the opinions, motives and actions of others but do NOT want your opinions, motives and actions to be examined by others. Classic double standard.

73 de Jim, N2EY

39. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <F1DF3FF9309FE410.71DFD7EA8A0EAB1F.58A3C05E508C4C7B@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 39

Yep, strangers, who know nothing of each other, probably would be civil and friendly to each other. It's once people learn a little of each other that personal likes and dislikes yield to those gracious types of feelings. Your "welcome" would be short-lived with most people, Larry, if you expressed yourself in the same manner as you do here in the Newsgroup. Simple fact.

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20000601004326.19467.00000430@nso-md.aol.com...
>
> BTW -- Whenever I've been in Texas, all the people I met were
> polite, friendly, and considerate -- nothing like you or Kim!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Delaware: They don't call it "The First State" for nothing!
>

40. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <77A3DB1A95D1375B.B98CCD3CDCBAE988.EA8EFD0934B0030A@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 40

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20000601055031.15983.00001820@nso-fk.aol.com...
> In article
<3DDCB1136890269A.3BB05C20C3021871.040E39D84B909E2E@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20000531220326.22842.00000062@nso-mf.aol.com...
> >
> >I don't think there's a contradiction.
>
> Of course you don't. That's why you don't like it when I point them out.
>

I haven't seen a contradiction yet. I find your observation that you think
I don't "like" something you've posted, quite interesting. The only
"feeling" I have about your posts is that our communication is nothing short
of a viciuos circle. You may have time for that, but I do not.

>
> >That is not a contradiction. It is a
> >difference of opinion.
>
> No, it's a contradiction. The thing to do is to check the premises - such
as
> "what is 'noise'?"
> >>

The first part of the scenario on that is the science of it. All else is
opinion, philosophy, etc.

> >> All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the answers,
in an
> >> effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their
reasoning. If
> >> their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.
> >>

And, that, dear Jim, is your opinion. But, you accept it as fact for
yourself.

> >
> >I am near certain you aren't interested in other peoples' opinions.
>
> You are completely mistaken about that. I'm greatly interested in other
> people's opinions. That does not mean I always agree with them or adopt

them as
> my own. I only do that when another's opinion is based on sound
reasoning.
>

Being interested in another person's opinions has nothing to do with whether you agree with them or "adopt" them as your own. It has to do with finding an interest in the aspect of another person's view, *without* regard to those things!! I didn't realize that we were trying to win friends and influence people. If I'd known such a thing, I'd have not let you see my *real* thoughts.

> I'm even more interested in relevant facts, such as those posted by
> knowledgeable folks like Phil Kane.
>

Then, initiate dialogue with Phil and quit wasting your time asking me your irrelevant questions.

> >I am
> >absolutely certain I am not interested in yours.
>
> That's quite obvious. Your motives in posting here are quite different
from
> mine. Just as your motives in callsign choice are different than mine.
>

There ya go....let's get right back full circle, eh? You don't like my callsign, and that has been the total motivation for your posts and dialogue here with me. You aren't interested in my opinion, you could care less. You *are* interested in maintaining a dialogue that publicizes your displeasure with my callsign. Thank you for proving my point.

> It's interesting to note that you want to express an opinion about
practically
> everything said here, and to examine the opinions, motives and actions of
> others but do NOT want your opinions, motives and actions to be examined
by
> others. Classic double standard.
>

I have no problem at all with debating opinions. I'd say the double standard is in your stating that you wish to debate, but more wish to condemn through your debate. See? It's all in perspective and opinion... :) PS--I wouldn't spend so much time being mad at someone for their choice of callsign, either. But, that's *my* perspective and *my* opinion.

Kim W5TIT

41. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <662B78851400338C.48C716D20F29B985.0939630BD8A0914C@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 41

You made way, way too much sense... ;)

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Peter Maus" <PeterMaus@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:3935D9E0.7499E107@worldnet.att.net...
>
> Avoidance of the minutiae permits
> avoidance of misrepresentation of the numbers.
>
> So it is with this discussion: Now involved in statistics of gang
> predation, instead of the issue of quality of life and liberty as
> the thread began.
>
> It's an interesting thing to watch.
>
> Just a thought.

42. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <8h5n4esko1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 42
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article ,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> wrote:
>
> > > I would not be surprised to see the total number of US hams reach
> > 700,000
> > > before February of 2001.
>
> > Now THAT sounds like a good bet. My guess is that the ARS
won't
> have
> > more than 680,000 members in 2/2001.
>
> How about a lobster dinner, payable the next time one of us in the
other's
> area.

Hey! That's MY bet!

"Everybody wants to get into the act" - Jimmy Durante

>I offer that by 2/28/2001 there will be more than 680,000 licensed
> Amateur Radio operators.

In the USA, as recorded by AH0A and/or the ARRL license totals. I
offered Stew something similar, but he wouldn't bite.

You get near EPA, Ed, lemme know, we'll do the lobster dinner thing
without a bet.
>
> > If there ISN'T a technical breakthru or effective license
restructuring
> > within the next 2 years, I expect the numbers to start steadily
> > decreasing beginning late this year.
>
> Add to it the shrimp cocktail, that the number of licensed US
amateurs on
> 2/28/2001 will be higher than it is on 12/31/2000.

I'm getting hungry.

Don't you mean 12/31/1999?
>
> > One thing that I know would spur interest, at least on the UHF
bands,

> > would be a decent low-cost, hi-speed(>56Kbps) digital radio. If we
see
> > such an animal in the near future, numbers will start to increase,
> > instead of decrease.

Maybe. What would folks DO with such a rig that they cannot do now with
9600 baud packet?
> >
73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

43. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <rMsZ4.35$d5.40504@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 43

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >> Why the hell would I need some steenking gyro or an even more
> >> steenking whiz-bang computer radio just to fly an R/C helicopter?
> >> I'm a natural-born R/C pilot -- literally just picked up a transmitter
> >> and started flying -- well!

> >What's this? You didn't prove your skill at flying by taking a test
first?
> >Does that mean that your flying accomplishments are not valid? :-)

> Flying radio controlled model airplanes does not require a license.
> The transmitters used to operate under Part 95 and required a CB
> license, but that requirement has been dropped; we now have
> about 50 channels in the 72 - 75 MHz region. Don't know all the
> technical details because I've been away from it for years. And
> whether or not my flying accomplishments are "valid" is something
> I could care less about. If some sort of licensing and testing for
> a license were necessary, I would just do whatever was necessary
> to pass the tests, then keyboard-slam all the lazy whiners who
> didn't want to learn something useful to pass the tests! Any
> other questions?

Yeah, but the answer would be as convoluted as this one was, so I am sure it would serve no purpose. I think that your answer showed your colors just fine, Larry; I am quite content to let it stand on its own.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

44. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Peter Maus <PeterMaus@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <39365B0F.5276D071@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 44

Steve Robeson wrote:
>

> >From: Peter Maus PeterMaus@worldnet.att.net
> >Date: 05/31/2000 10:34 PM Central Daylight Time
>
> >Personally, I invite individuals requiring statistics to look them up
> themselves, and verify at the same time the validity of the source<
>
> I would have loved to, Peter, except Cecil refused (is still refusing) to
> cite his source to BE validated.

He is the source. He expressed an opinion. There is no supporting
source to a personal opinion. Further, he explained why he expressed
the opinion that he did.
>
> > So it is with this discussion: Now involved in statistics of gang predation,
> instead of the issue of quality of life and liberty as the thread began.<
>
> Quality of life...in gang infested communities? Here is where you should
> back up and consider the QUANTITY of life.
>
And so the argument shifts from the picture to the frame. Derailed
again.

> >There is no faster way to guarantee the limitless life of a thread on Usenet,
> than to say say "F*ck You" in Netspeak: Cite Your Source.<
>
> Thank you for your insight.
>
> Are you kin to Miss Manners or Len Anderson?

Cute, but not relevant...unless you're sewing the lace on my
apron.

45. Re: "Dirty Words" or why does Cecil sprew bull shit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: General Mark Morgan <one.big.asshole@ahole.com>
Message-ID: <393679BE.C351A732@ahole.com>
Source record: 45

Hey Cecil, you mean you live in Texas and have never been in a
tornado? Been here 10 years and went through two.....

W6RCecilA wrote:
>
> General Mark Morgan wrote:
> > Pure bull shit. Seems everything has happened to Cecil. Is there
> > anything that hasn't?
>
> When one lives on the edge for 45 years, a lot of things happen.
> But everything has not happened. I have never been in a plane
> crash. Amazingly enough, I have never been in a tornado. I've
> been shot at but never hit. Lots of things haven't happened
> to me.
> --
> 73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

46. Re: "Dirty Words": Hey Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: General Mark Morgan <one.big.asshole@ahole.com>
Message-ID: <39367A07.9CA667D7@ahole.com>
Source record: 46

Byte me......

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> General Mark Morgan wrote
> >Hey Aaron, if you can read the subject line said Hey Larry, NOT hey
> >Aaron. Please keep your comments to yourself...
>
> Hey General, this is an *open newsgroup*. Please keep your comments to
> yourself if you don't want a group response...

47. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim West <Jim@jameswest.com>
Message-ID: <kspcjsktuf10186v06tks2d6tjhlf0ikk7@4ax.com>
Source record: 47
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

On Wed, 31 May 2000 11:23:28 -0400, "Sycho_Graphics"
<Sycho_Graphics@email.msn.com> wrote:

>In short, WHO CARES. Let the ignorant, self-centered, egotistical basterds
>all go away so I don't have to hear about how great HAM was in 1960 one more
>damn time. I think they are a joke, cops think they are a joke, most local
>authorities (In real cities not shit towns) think they are a joke, anyone
>under the age of 30 thinks they are a joke, they are the only ones who seem
>to take themselves (way too) seriously. BYE, bye and good riddance.

Couldn't pass the morse code test eh?

>
>
>"me" <@.> wrote in message
>news:1BC5AB4B06B6F8D8.AAC0E5EAFC5FA110.82C6E091ECEFDFD2@lp.airnews.net...
>Funny. In 2 or so years there will be 200 hams.
>Those 200 hams will still think there are alot of hams.
>1 HAM is one ego and a waste of time too many (CW). :)
>
>

48. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39366D0D.9139B536@IEEE.org>
Source record: 48

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Izzat so? Well, if you come to Dover, just remember not to walk
> down S. New St. or Capitol Park alone after sundown -- or you're
> going to end up deeply regretting it!

Larry, are you going to shoot me on sight?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

49. Re: "Dirty Words" or why does Cecil sprew bull shit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39366D97.83884C59@IEEE.org>
Source record: 49

General Mark Morgan wrote:
> Hey Cecil, you mean you live in Texas and have never been in a
> tornado? Been here 10 years and went through two.....

That's right. I have never even seen a tornado except
on television. I feel left out. My daughter has lived
in Texas for only a year and has seen one.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

50. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39366CA7.F2CBEF7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 50

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> BTW -- Whenever I've been in Texas, all the people I met were
> polite, friendly, and considerate --

I'm really surprised any Texan would be friendly to
you after you told him that he "would end up
deeply regretting" any deviation from your personal
Victorian principles.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

51. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <393671F6.424610CD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 51

Peter Maus wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson wrote:
> > I would have loved to, Peter, except Cecil refused (is still refusing) to
> > cite his source to BE validated.
>
> He is the source. He expressed an opinion. There is no supporting
> source to a personal opinion. Further, he explained why he expressed
> the opinion that he did.

Stating that I wouldn't be surprised if the majority of gangs
were white is the *absolute truth*. I definitely would NOT be
surprised if the majority of gangs were white. It is up to
Steve to prove that I would be surprised. So Steve, how are
you going to prove that I would be surprised?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

52. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39366F08.74526C00@IEEE.org>
Source record: 52

Steve Robeson wrote:
> >From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >It's pretty hard for a non-member of MENSA to understand, Steve. The area
> >under the upper 2% of the bell-shaped curve does not average out to 1%.
>
> You may find this hard to believe, Cecil. but it does not require a
> MENSA-leval IQ nor a degree in statistics to understand the workings
> of a bell curve.

Do I need to put a smiley face on it for the humor impaired?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

53. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39367131.5E009050@IEEE.org>
Source record: 53

Steve Robeson wrote:
> I would have loved to, Peter, except Cecil refused (is still refusing) to
> cite his source to BE validated.

Site the source of my statement that I wouldn't be surprised
if the majority of gangs were white? Why, my brain, of course,
which needs no validation. I thought that should be obvious.
I exist, therefore I think. Incidentally, I know of lots of
motorcycle gangs composed of law-abiding citizens. Gangs don't
necessarily have to be engaged in illegal acts. Motorcycle
magazines have advertisments eliciting members for gangs.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

54. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8h5qt002987@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 54

In article <20000601004325.19467.00000429@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <393590B2.262596F3@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>
>>
>>A B.S/M.E. degree, MENSA membership, and 45 years of experience
>>are not enough?
>>
>
>Cecil:
>
>If you're so smart, why aren't you a Post hole Digger?

They've got machines to do that now.

Tom - N8ECW

55. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8h5r5v12987@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 55

In article <20000601055031.15983.00001820@nso-fk.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com says...

<snippage deleted>

>> If
>>I say a tree *is* making noise in the woods, even if nothing is around to
>>hear it; you might say it does not.
>
>True.
>
>>That is not a contradiction. It is a
>>difference of opinion.
>
>No, it's a contradiction. The thing to do is to check the premises - such as
>"what is 'noise'?"
>>>
>>> All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the answers, in
>>an
>>> effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their reasoning.
>>If
>>> their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.
>>>
>>
>>I am near certain you aren't interested in other peoples' opinions.

<more snippage deleted>

This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
argument.

Tom - N8ECW

56. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <393677AB.C3C9E318@IEEE.org>
Source record: 56

Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >I said I wouldn't be surprised if the majority of gangs are white.<
>
> That's NOT what you said, Cecil.

Yes it is, Steve.

> > That's NOT an assertion that the majority of gangs are white.<
>
> Your original post was.

I've had a computer crash and can't locate the post, Steve,
so it is up to you to prove that you are not lying. I would
not state that white gangs are in the majority because I do
not possess that knowledge.

> >Why do you make false statements?<
>
> I haven't made one in this thread, Cecil. I HAVE called into question
> YOUR assertion and asked you to validate it with some sort of facts.

I don't recall making that assertion, Steve, and I can't find
it in the past postings. I seriously doubt that it exists.

> Why do you engineer questions so as to be insulting and misleading when
> you know such is not the case?

I don't know that at all, Steve. All I have is your word and
no proof. That's not enough.

> We used to call that a "cheap shot". VERY much below the character of a
> person alleged to be a MENSA member or a fellow of the IEEE, isn't it?

From my perspective, you are falsely accusing of something that
I didn't say. That's what I call a cheap shot.

> "There are as many white gangs as there are black" (your initial comment)
> is a statement, NOT an opinion.

Please produce the posting, Steve. I don't remember saying that
but if I did, it was certainly only an opinion. You are simply
lying when you say I made that as a statement of fact. I have
previously stated that unless I state something is a fact, then
it is just my personal opinion.

And it is still my opinion that there are as many white
gangs as there are black gangs. There are many, many law-abiding
gangs that don't appear on the lists you have presented. I, myself,
am a member of a white motorcycle gang which would not appear on
your lists. Since whites outnumber blacks by such a large percentage,
it is only logical that there would be more white gangs than
black gangs. Why would a law-abiding white gang appear on any
of the lists you have presented?

> Please try some accuracy, OK?

Please stop lying about what I said.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

57. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936785B.DDBEA25D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 57

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Cecil: If you're so smart, why aren't you a Post hole Digger?

My goal was to retire with a million bucks.
I didn't need a PhD for that.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

58. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601110420.04654.00001368@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 58

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: Peter Maus PeterMaus@worldnet.att.net
>Date: 06/01/2000 7:45 AM Central Daylight Time

>He is the source. He expressed an opinion.<

No, he made a statement. "There are more white gangs than black"

> There is no supporting source to a personal opinion.<

Quite true, if what is stated is expressed AS an opinion.

>Further, he explained why he expressed the opinion that he did.<

Several days AFTER the fact and being repeatedly asked to qualify his assertion.

> And so the argument shifts from the picture to the frame. Derailed again.<

Yes, by Cecil. But that seems to be neither here NOR there.

>Cute, but not relevant...unless you're sewing the lace on my apron<

Maybe not relevant, but close to home, judging by your response.

Steve

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

59. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601111151.04654.00001369@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 59

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 06/01/2000 9:23 AM Central Daylight Time

>Stating that I wouldn't be surprised if the majority of gangs were white is the *absolute truth*<

In this context there would have been no question as to the "source" of your "information" or that this was an opinion, not a fact.

>I definitely would NOT be surprised if the majority of gangs were white.<

I am sure you wouldn't.

>It is up to Steve to prove that I would be surprised. So Steve, how are you going to prove that I would be surprised?<

In this context, were are expressing opinions, not attempting to determine the source of your information to support your assertions.

I am sure you would not be surprised, but the facts available would disprove it.

It's not for me to prove one way or the other, Cecil. The question was what is the source of your assertion that there are more white gangs than black.

You have since backpeddled, tried to make everyone believe that you said something else and are now stating that it was only an opinion.

You now further dilute the issue by trying to place some responsibility upon me to prove wether or not you'd be surprised about something.

Not very Mensan, is it?

Steve

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

60. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601112035.19467.00000561@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 60

In article <F1DF3FF9309FE410.71DFD7EA8A0EAB1F.58A3C05E508C4C7B@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>
>Yep, strangers, who know nothing of each other, probably would be civil and
>friendly to each other. It's once people learn a little of each other that
>personal likes and dislikes yield to those gracious types of feelings. Your
>"welcome" would be short-lived with most people, Larry, if you expressed
>yourself in the same manner as you do here in the Newsgroup. Simple fact.

Kim:

Well, whenever I'd visited Texas, I did not run into anyone like you
or Cecil; therefore, there was no reason to react to them the same way
I react to the two of you in this newsgroup!

73 de Larry, K3LT

61. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601112035.19467.00000562@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 61

In article <39366CA7.F2CBEF7C@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> BTW -- Whenever I've been in Texas, all the people I met were
>> polite, friendly, and considerate --
>
>I'm really surprised any Texan would be friendly to
>you after you told him that he "would end up
>deeply regretting" any deviation from your personal
>Victorian principles.

Cecil:

Well, I guess I've never been in Kim's neck o' the woods, and the
issue never came up! And another thing I did notice about the Texans
I'd met is that they were very decent, modest, and moral people --
who would most likely be just as offended by Kim's call sign as
I was! In fact, I believe that they would find Kim's call sign to be
demeaning, uncouth, and very un-Texan-like! Yes, I found Texas
to be a very fine place, indeed -- but you and Kim would seem to
have a lot to answer for to the fine, decent, moral, upstanding
citizens of The Lone Star State!

73 de Larry, K3LT

62. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601112036.19467.00000563@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 62

In article <39366D0D.9139B536@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Izzat so? Well, if you come to Dover, just remember not to walk
>> down S. New St. or Capitol Park alone after sundown -- or you're
>> going to end up deeply regretting it!
>
>Larry, are you going to shoot me on sight?
>

Cecil:

Uh, no -- **I** wouldn't be caught dead on S. New St. or Capitol Park!
And why would I shoot you? You're my favorite varmint!

73 de Larry, K3LT

63. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8h5reg22987@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 63

In article <20000601004327.19467.00000433@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <20000531162040.00132.00000867@ng-fu1.aol.com>,
>kk7ho@aol.communicate (KK7HO) writes:
>
>>
>>You'll be OK Larry, one of these days. Just keep taking the Prozak as
>>prescribed.
>>
>
>Prozak? What's that?

Either you've been living in a cave for the past ten years, or you've taken so much Prozak that you've forgotten what it is.

Tom - N8ECW

64. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39367DA9.4DD70F38@IEEE.org>
Source record: 64

Steve Robeson wrote:
> No, he made a statement. "There are more white gangs than black"

Please reproduce the quote, Steve. My computer is sick and
I cannot find it. I suspect I said, "There are probably more
white gangs than black". And you have produced no valid
evidence to prove I'm wrong. Please show me your list of
law-abiding gangs. It still stands to reason that since
there are so many more whites than blacks, then there
would be more white gangs than black gangs. My motorcycle
gang is 100% white.

> > There is no supporting source to a personal opinion.<
>
> Quite true, if what is stated is expressed AS an opinion.

I have previously stated, Steve, that all my postings are
simply opinions unless otherwise noted. An opinion is my
official default position, you know that, and you are just
being a jerk.

> >Further, he explained why he expressed the opinion that he did.<
>
> Several days AFTER the fact and being repeatedly asked to qualify his
> assertion.

Well, excuuuuse me, Your Royal Highnee. Guess when the Great One
speaks, all us commoners are supposed to step and fetch'it.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

65. Re: Behind the scenes in the Walker Household.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <sjd1bms25ri36@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 65

I love it! TIT gets slammed!

Woulff hong scores Big Time!

integrity@arrl.sucks.org (Wouff Hong) wrote in
<8h2bv1deh1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>:
>
>Kim's Husband: Dinner was great tonight hon, was that a new recipe?
>
>TIT: No, I just kept your TV-Dinner in the microwave a bit longer this
>time.
>
>Kim's Husband: Oh, Thanks, you must have found the directions on the
>package.
>
>TIT: When you're finished eating could you fix my 11 meter antenna? its
>acting up again. I'm getting high SWR with the Linear in-line.
>
>Kim's Husband: Sure thing babe, maybe afterwards we could cuddle a
>little.
>
>TIT: Wish I could, but I got to get back to my LID friends on
>rec.radio.amateur.policy, we're trashing people who want to save ham
>radio and they need my help.
>
>Kim's Husband: Sounds complicated.
>
>TIT: It is, but we have the help of my old high school sweetheart,
>Cecil, and the backing of the ARRL in the person of Ed Hare. I think
>we're making progress. There are quite a few others helping too.
>
>Kim's Husband: The toilet paper was all gone in the bathroom, so I had
>to use a paper that came from the FCC.
>
>TIT: That's o.k., Ham Licenses are easy to get now. I hope you used the
>backside. I had to use the frontside earlier.
>
>Kim's Husband: Yes, I saw where you left your mark. It's a bit lumpy
>now, I hope you can get it back in the frame.
>
>TIT: I'll scrape it with a butter knife after I make a few posts.
>
>
>
>

>
>

66. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601120647.19467.00000566@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 66

In article <8h5reg22987@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant) writes:

>>>You'll be OK Larry, one of these days. Just keep taking the Prozak as
>>>prescribed.
>>>
>>
>>Prozak? What's that?
>
>Either you've been living in a cave for the past ten years, or you've taken
>so
>much Prozak that you've forgotten what it is.

Hmmm. Well, I did a Lycos search on the string "Prosak," and I found things like "Prosak dunnage bags," and some doctors by that name, and a few other references. However, in this context, I believe you're referring to "Prosak" as some sort of medication... and I'm not getting anything like that.

Now, there is an anti-depressant called "Prosac," but obviously, you wern't talking about that! Maybe if you took your Ritilin, your spelling would improve!

73 de Larry, K3LT

67. Re: "Dirty Words": Hey Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <u17wbV#y$GA.325@cpmsnbbsa07>
Source record: 67

General Mark Morgan wrote
>Byte me......

Your motherboard has a hard drive...

68. Re: "Dirty Words": Hey Larry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Peter Maus <PeterMaus@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <39369037.B40A017E@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 68

> General Mark Morgan wrote
> >Byte me......
>
>
> General Mark Morgan <one.big.asshole@ahole.com>

Any other questions?

69. Re: stamp design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <sjd3k6jo5ri177@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 69

Ed, how much is the BoD paying you per Post for spreading bullshit? They might quit paying you.

Ed Hare, W1RFI the ARRL BoD propaganda machine, goofed and told a dirty BoD secret in response to n4aox:

>Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
>> Lastly, encourage your BoD to send out questionaires canvasing their
>> constituents on various upcoming issues.

They don't listen to what the membership wants Clay. The BoD has already ignored & screwed the membership over a year and a half ago in a big way. I guess what the ham community wanted wasn't in the vested interest of the corprate bank account.

>My director has done so on a number of occasions.
>
>Polling is NOT the best way to get member input, IMHO; issues are best
>solved by those who have more vested interest than checking off a box
>on a question they may or may not fully understand or may or may not be
>very interested in.

See Ed, what you wrote in the above paragraph proves my point. Why poll the membership when it might go against the vested interest of the BoD. Your screwed up BoD assholes have ignored the membership so many times I don't know why you continue to hold elections!

70. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <39369358.CF013BA3@uci.edu>
Source record: 70

Larry W4CSC wrote:

> On Fri, 26 May 2000 17:13:29 -0700, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
> >Or.....well, it is growing, but the new folks will lose interest in ham
> >radio because of the code test. :-)

> What "code test"? I didn't see no "code test".....(c;

Yes, Larry, there is a code test. The FCC refers to it as Element 1.
Stick around, you have much to learn. :-)

73, Jim AC6XG

71. Re: Callsigns - was Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3936926D.967A8193@uci.edu>
Source record: 71

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Fri, 26 May 2000, Jim Kelley wrote:
> > N2EY was correct. The FCC has skipped those calls. Try UALR.

> Unsubstantiated claim.
> Real proof would be to obtain the FCC's "lockout file."

It's called circumstantial evidence. The fact that the calls weren't issued indicates that they have been "locked-out". Would you care to prove otherwise?

73, Jim AC6XG

72. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <sjd59j1q5ri119@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 72

Be gentle with Ed, Larry. He's struggling with trying to balance what he knows is right on the inside with what the ARRL and the Whiner crowd want on the outside.

Don't give in to the Dark-side "Luke". Oops, to late, Gotta keep the BoD happy to get a paycheck.

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in <20000601004326.19467.00000432@nso-md.aol.com>:

>In article <HUcZ4.23$d5.33043@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
><w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:
>>What's this? You didn't prove your skill at flying by taking a test
>>first? Does that mean that your flying accomplishments are not valid?
>>:-)
>>
>
>Ed:
>
>Flying radio controlled model airplanes does not require a license.
>The transmitters used to operate under Part 95 and required a CB
>license, but that requirement has been dropped; we now have
>about 50 channels in the 72 - 75 MHz region. Don't know all the
>technical details because I've been away from it for years. And
>whether or not my flying accomplishments are "valid" is something
>I could care less about. If some sort of licensing and testing for
>a license were necessary, I would just do whatever was necessary
>to pass the tests, then keyboard-slam all the lazy whiners who
>didn't want to learn something useful to pass the tests! Any
>other questions?
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

73. Re: FCC TO DO AWAY WITH LICENSE REQUIREMENTS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <sjd5vp3n5ri146@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 73

This wouldn't be very fair. Most post April 15th license candidates don't know who their daddy is. Of course, the League could step in and forge permission slips, and then give a membership discount to boot!

mailfrmpa@aol.com (MailfrmPA) wrote in
<20000529125623.22354.00000413@ng-cv1.aol.com>:
>In their place will be Permission Slips, filled in and signed by Parent
>or Legal Guardian, or other responsible Adult! Those without a
>Permission Slip will not be allowed to go on the bands.
>
>Will HF be next??
>
>K�MB
>

74. Re: Lee Roberts Loves Kim's Callsign: ATTN: Lee

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <39369995.53AE5734@uci.edu>
Source record: 74

W6RCecilA wrote:
> I understand that words, by themselves, have little effect except
> on someone's feelings. If someone says something hurtful to you in
> a language you don't understand, does it hurt? It is your understanding
> of what was said that causes the hurt, i.e. you are cooperating in
> generating your own pain. I did that when I was very young but no more.

Do you allow them to cause you to ocassionally become somewhat irate and
slightly irrational? :-)

73, Jim AC6XG

75. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: billsohl@interactive.net
Message-ID: <39369e31.2136511@news.interactive.net>
Source record: 75

On 01 Jun 2000 05:25:11 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>Date: 05/31/2000 10:08 PM Central Daylight Time
>
>>It's pretty hard for a non-member of MENSA to understand, Steve. The area
>under the upper 2% of the bell-shaped curve does not average out to 1%.<
>
> You may find this hard to believe, Cecil. but it does not require a
>MENSA-leval IQ nor a degree in statistics to understand the workings of a bell
>curve.
>
> And the percentage under that 2% doesn't impress me when the other 98% of
>that curve pulls that 2% closer to the middle.
>
> Not very impressive.

And just what does any of that have to do with
CC&Rs as the subject of this thread?

r.r.a.p. sure has gone rather banal these days.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

76. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601133434.09673.00000396@ng-mf1.aol.com>
Source record: 76

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 06/01/2000 9:11 AM Central Daylight Time

>Do I need to put a smiley face on it for the humor impaired?<

What would it matter? We can't take you seriously anyway, Cecil....isn't
that what you said?

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight
in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

77. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601133836.09673.00000397@ng-mf1.aol.com>
Source record: 77

>Subject: Re: an article about manners in USA Today
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 06/01/2000 9:48 AM Central Daylight Time

>I've had a computer crash and can't locate the post, Steve, so it is up to
you to prove that you are not lying.<

Well, Cecil, I am not the one making assertions they won't back up.

As for your computer crash, Deja is not archived on your system.

I didn't make any assertions requiring any validation.
>I would not state that white gangs are in the majority because I do not
possess that knowledge.<

You didn't state there was more white gangs than black...you said there
were as many. And finally you admit that you do not have any facts.

Thank you...that's all it took.

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight
in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

78. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A2EB.72367B1C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 78

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> And why would I shoot you?

Because you have threatened me with "ending up very
much regretting" being me. The only way I would
regret being me is if you shot me because I am
being me.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

79. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A337.5FACAC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 79

"T.L. Bryant" wrote:
> Either you've been living in a cave for the past ten years, or you've taken so
> much Prozak that you've forgotten what it is.

Tom, he just didn't know you were talking about
Russian Prozac. :-)
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

80. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A25F.DBFBB9BF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 80

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Well, I guess I've never been in Kim's neck o' the woods, and the
> issue never came up! And another thing I did notice about the Texans
> I'd met is that they were very decent, modest, and moral people --

Who, unlike you, do not try to force their morality on
their neighbors. Most people in my neighborhood believe
it is wrong to consume alcohol but they do not try to
keep me from consuming alcohol.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

81. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A3A7.A8D1E4EA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 81

Steve Robeson wrote:
> What would it matter? We can't take you seriously anyway, Cecil....isn't
> that what you said?

Of course. That's why I don't use smiley faces.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

82. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601134757.09673.00000398@ng-mf1.aol.com>
Source record: 82

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 06/01/2000 10:13 AM Central Daylight Time

>Please reproduce the quote, Steve. My computer is sick and I cannot find it.<

It's already archived, Cecil.

>I suspect I said, "There are probably more white gangs than black".<

Grape fog clouding your memory, Cecil?

>And you have produced no valid evidence to prove I'm wrong.<

I have provided the sources of professional writings on the matter that document the problem. You hem and haw.

>Please show me your list of law-abiding gangs.<

I never said there were any, Cecil. Where did you come up with THIS one at?

>It still stands to reason that since there are so many more whites than blacks, then there would be more white gangs than black gangs.<

Oh..."stand to reason"...?

>My motorcycle gang is 100% white.<

Congratulations.

>An opinion is my official default position, you know that, and you are just being a jerk.<

Ooooh....getting a might testy, aren't we, Cecil?

You make a statement.

You are asked to provide the basis upon which you make that statement.

You then begin English grammar lessons and avoiding any direct answer.

You CLAIM to be a member of MENSA and have an IQ of 160, yet you seem to have some very significant comprehnsion problems, complicated by you inability to respond to simple questions with simple answers.

>Well, excuuuuse me, Your Royal Highnee. Guess when the Great One speaks, all us commoners are supposed to step and fetch'it.<

Childish, Cecil...VERRRRRRY childish.

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

83. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A489.551E70F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 83

Steve Robeson wrote:
> I am sure you would not be surprised, but the facts available would
> disprove it.

Oh, then you must have a list of all the law-abiding gangs.
Would you please publish that reference?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

84. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A79B.ECE2E3B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 84

Steve Robeson wrote:
> Well, Cecil, I am not the one making assertions they won't back up.

Of course you are, Steve. You are making assertions about
something I don't think I said. What if I said you told
me to "Eat $hit!". Would that make the assertion true?

> As for your computer crash, Deja is not archived on your system.

What was the date and title of the thread?

> I didn't make any assertions requiring any validation.

So Your Royal Highnee can just assert that someone is
wrong without any proof whatsoever. I think I understand.

> You didn't state there was more white gangs than black...you said there
> were as many. And finally you admit that you do not have any facts.

Ah, but I have logic on my side. There are approximately ten
times as many white people as black people in the US. You have
admitted that you have no valid references for the number of
law-abiding gangs. Until you present some proof otherwise, I
will continue believing in probability.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

85. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8h66qc0d87@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 85

In article <20000601120647.19467.00000566@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <8h5reg22987@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant)
>writes:
>
>>>>You'll be OK Larry, one of these days. Just keep taking the Prozak as
>>>>prescribed.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Prozak? What's that?
>>
>>Either you've been living in a cave for the past ten years, or you've taken
>>so
>>much Prozak that you've forgotten what it is.
>
>Hmmm. Well, I did a Lycos search on the string "Prosak," and I
>found things like "Prosak dunnage bags," and some doctors by
>that name, and a few other references. However, in this context,
>I believe you're referring to "Prosak" as some sort of medication...
>and I'm not getting anything like that.
>
>Now, there is an anti-depressant called "Prosac," but obviously,
>you wern't talking about that! Maybe if you took your Ritilin, your
>spelling would improve!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

86. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A5F6.EB5D38A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 86

Steve Robeson wrote:
> >Please show me your list of law-abiding gangs.<
>
> I never said there were any, Cecil. Where did you come up with THIS one
> at?

Well, if you don't know how many law-abiding gangs there
are, you cannot possibly know whether there are more
black gangs than white gangs.

> You make a statement.
> You are asked to provide the basis upon which you make that statement.

Sorry that I upset Your Royal Highnee by not reacting
fast enough for you. I have been dead in the water and
missed half the postings because the installation program
for my new modem wiped out most of my drivers.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

87. Re: Lee Roberts Loves Kim's Callsign: ATTN: Lee

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3936A669.46641CD1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 87

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Do you allow them to cause you to ocassionally become somewhat irate and
> slightly irrational? :-)

I didn't say I was perfect, Jim. But everytime it happens,
I know I've lost my humanity and given in to my reptilian
brain.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

88. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <nospam@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnarirevbznvypbz.fvhn9g3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88

On Thu, 01 Jun 2000 11:41:47 -0700, Jim Kelley wrote:

>
>
>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> The only one that can add a C, C or R to property is a seller,
>> and they must be recorded the same as a deed.
>
>Can a seller similarly subtract provisions from a CC&R?

In a Planned Unit Deveopment (the California term) all affected
property owners in the PUD have to agree.

73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

89. Re: Lee Roberts Loves Kim's Callsign: ATTN: Lee

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3936AC18.48AD154A@uci.edu>
Source record: 89

W6RCecilA wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Do you allow them to cause you to ocassionally become somewhat irate and
> > slightly irrational? :-)

> I didn't say I was perfect, Jim. But everytime it happens,
> I know I've lost my humanity and given in to my reptilian
> brain.

Ahhh, don't blame it on defenseless creatures. Humans are much better known for their tendancy to become irate and irrational in reaction to words than are reptiles.

Did you see the Star Trek Next Generation episode where Jordie turned into a reptile-like creature? Quite thought provoking.

73, Jim AC6XG

90. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <8h6mrihst1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 90

In this whole discussion of what offends and who has the responsibility to decide, I've started thinking about all the possible combinations of prefixes, numerals, and suffixes that might form suggestive phrases, might be "phonetic-ed" into suggestive phrases, ..., and so on.

1. I always get a twinge when I hear/read someone saying that such-and-such is obviously offensive, obviously pornographic, obviously not appropriate for children.

2. I'm reminded of the wonderful George Carlin "Seven Words" routine. Would I want my granddaughter to hear that performance? No. But there are many other words that are regularly overheard on the streets, in elevators, and even (heaven forbid) in the parking lots of churches that are just as offensive and just as awkward to explain when she asks about them. She will hear will hear each of those words, and many of the others that I find upsetting, in the course of her life. She will have the loving instructional support of her parents, both sets of grand parents, her great grand parents, and even a great-great grandmother to help her understand not only the context and the inappropriateness of the language, but also be helped to examine some of the issues that come out of hearing those words.

3. Some of the most vocal folks when it comes to controling what others say or do are the same folks who resent anyone trying to control what they say or do. Don't tell me whether I can or can't have guns. Don't tell me that I have to wear a motorcycle helmet. But let me tell you what you can say, let me tell you what you can do behind closed doors in the privacy of your own home.

Life's too short.
--
Carl Zager
KB9RVB
kb9rvb@my-deja.com

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

91. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <nospam@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnarirevbznvypbz.fvhjn21.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 91

On 01 Jun 2000 16:06:47 GMT, Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>Now, there is an anti-depressant called "Prosac," but obviously,
>you wern't talking about that! Maybe if you took your Ritilin, your
>spelling would improve!
>
Maybe if you took your RITALIN yours would, too.

Gotcha.

73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

92. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3936AE6B.66F03321@uci.edu>
Source record: 92

Phil Kane wrote:

> The only one that can add a C, C or R to property is a seller,
> and they must be recorded the same as a deed.

Can a seller similarly subtract provisions from a CC&R?

Thanks and 73,

Jim AC6XG

93. Cable Modems

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <nospam@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnarirevbznvypbz.fvhnm64.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 93

On 31 May 2000 03:17:25 GMT, T.L. Bryant wrote:

>Winblows...err, Windows '98 machine

My condolences.....

>that I have to use because the cable company refuses to support Linux,

Does not the cableco deliver a TCP/IP connection on a RJ-45 out
of their bridge and cannot you reach their IP address from
your TCP/IP applications such as a browser running under linux??

What is there to "support"?

Alternatibely, will the linux Win Emulator programs ("wine" or
equivalent) not run any Win application that the cableco insist on?

I run into this "we don't support your system" quite often
because I run IBM's OS/2 Warp as my OS of choice.

Lastly, LinkSys makes a series of inexpensive 4-port-LAN
routers which effectiovely isolate the TCP/IP internet
connection from whatever operating system you are running. I
use the model that interfaces with a dial-up modem and our son
uses the model that interfaces with a TCP/IP RJ45 connection such
as Cable Modem or DSL. Your computer communicates with the
router. the router setup is through a browser of your choice,
and the router communicates with the outside world. Some of
them even include a real firewall. Check out <www.linksys.com>.

73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

94. Re: Lee Roberts Loves Kim's Callsign: ATTN: Lee

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <8h6nulimc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 94

STOP IT!
All of you!
We have things to do and people to see.
If you can't all behave, I'm sending each of you to your rooms.
Now, stop it, this instant.
That's IT!
To your rooms. Now!

--
Carl Zager
KB9RVB
kb9rvb@my-deja.com

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

95. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601155628.06296.00001298@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 95

>Subject: Re: an article about manners in USA Today
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 06/01/2000 1:12 PM Central Daylight Time

>You are making assertions about something I don't think I said.<

You don't THINK you said?

Pretty well shoots the 160 IQ and Mensa thing all to hell, doesn't
it...?!?!?

Can't remember something you said/did only a couple days ago, Cecil?

Have you considered AA...?!?!

96. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3936AD73.C91D2F96@uci.edu>
Source record: 96

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Fri, 26 May 2000 21:51:37 -0700, Aaron Jones wrote:
> >Someone had the guts to mess with a lawyer?? Hard to fathom...

> All guts, no brains......

Isn't there usually a lawyer on both sides of a dispute?

73, Jim AC6XG

97. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <nospam@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnarirevbznvypbz.fvhn5e2.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 97

On Thu, 01 Jun 2000 11:37:39 -0700, Jim Kelley wrote:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>> On Fri, 26 May 2000 21:51:37 -0700, Aaron Jones wrote:
>> >Someone had the guts to mess with a lawyer?? Hard to fathom...
>
>> All guts, no brains......
>
>Isn't there usually a lawyer on both sides of a dispute?

In my experiences both as a lawyer representing individual
owners, and as a member and sometime director of a HOA, the
HOAs try it themselves first, and then when their lawyer has to
get into the situation, the matter which could have been solved
easily is alreadfy screwed up far beyond recognition.

73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

98. Re: FCC TO DO AWAY WITH LICENSE REQUIREMENTS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h6p7njfn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 98

In article <kriZ4.29$d5.36667@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
>
> >> Word from insiders at FCC is that all technical AND cw requirements
> >> for VHF and UHF licenses are soon to be eliminated!
>
> > Hmmm...There might be some truth in this rumor.
>
> I think not. Surely you cannot believe it.

I spoke with tounge in cheek. Surely I don't want to believe it...BUT
if the present trends continue...Who knows???
>
> > Maybe it is but wishful thinking on the part of the ARRL....
>
> I can say with certainty that the ARRL does not support such a
proposal.

Some Hams couldn't believe that the ARRL would support the proposals
that were offered to the NPRM. BUT they did. Now that is history.
What is next? What will the ARRL do in the future when they find that
there are fewer new licensed hams than they had hoped for? I dunno.
How do you know? How can you speak with any certainty about the future?
>
> > especially those who can only think of the number of Hams of
> > any abilities that can be said to make the hobby more popular.
>
> Can you say with any certainty just who this "those" is? A name or
two
> might be more convincing than a vague and unprovable accusation.

I'll name all of the present ARRL stafff who have stated that Ham Radio
is not a technical hobby. This includes the ARRL president and some of
the VPs. Et tu Ed?

> > So far there is no more 20 wpm cw requirement for Extra, no more
13 wpm
> > requirement for General, and no more Novice, Tech Plus, or Advanced
> > Class.
>
> > When will the next shoes drop???
>
> Okay, I give up. What it the date and nature of the next change you
expect

> to see in ham radio. On what do you base your estimate of the date
and the
> specifics of the change?

Heck I can't predict exact dates. What do you think I
am...Nostrodamus??? I can only guess where the present trends may lead
if there isn't some serious back-lash to restore Hamdom to its defined
Basis and Purpose. I can't talk with any certainty. I can only say
that the hobby is showing symptoms of being sick...I can't be certain
if it will get sicker or will recover and get back to being its old
self again.
>
> > If trends continue there may well be no requirements for Tech
license
> > privilages...and next no requirements for any ham privilages...and
IMHO
> > this can only be expected to lead to no Ham Radio at all for
anybody.
>
> Eliminating a requirement that no longer serves the same purpose it
served
> when it was introduced in the early part of the last century is not a
> "trend." On second thought, maybe it is -- one that hopefully could
> indicate that amateur radio might once again get in touch with modern
radio
> technology. Is this what you are suggesting should be happening?

You got it! FERGET MORSE. Just think about MODERN TECHNOLOGIES.

> > As a result of this trend half of the Real Hams
> > will be silent keys in a few years.
>
> Do you really think that the changes in the Morse code testing will
increase
> the death rate of Amateurs?

No but the old incentives that encouraged techie types to be Hams are
all but gone because the leadership does not belive that Ham Radio
should be promoted as PRIMARILY A TECHNICAL HOBBY. Hams themselves do
not believe that many of them can learn to build their own equipment
and experiment or learn enough technology to keep up with the changing
state of the art. This and my entire post has absolutely nothing to do
with any Morse code requirements or a complete lack of them.

> > They can not be Real Hams if they lose innovative
> > motivation, pioneering spirit, sporting curiosity,
> > and don't have any technical intrests in
> > common.
>
> And there are some who offer that eliminating a Morse code test will
indeed
> result in some hams focusing their attention to "pioneering spirit."

Most
> of the pioneering I can envision does not include OOK CW.

Whats MORSE got to do with it? Ham Radio can be a Technical Hobby
with or without Morse. We are talking about technical dumbing down and
technical obsolesence NOT MORSE CODE. Since the development of
radiotelephone technology there have always been Hams who are not
especially interested in operating CW. At one time such Hams were
challenged by the Class A license exam...which became the Advanced
class. It was meant to increase the Ham's knowledge of radiotelephony
at the time when it was still a modern development.
Today we need more license classes to encourage those who are inclined
to pursue and learn about the many new communication techniques that
can be utilized by the progressive Hams of the future.

A few questions on the Extra class exam are not going to do it.

> > Sadly there will be no higher Ham classes to be promoted to.
>
> I guess that hams will have to promote themselves with
accomplishments, much
> like Larry Roll's learning to fly model R/C airplanes.

Yep...Dumbo the elephant could fly too (according to Disney), as long
as he carried Jimminy Cricket and a magic feather. I would rather
think that any self made flying model builder would have to learn some
real aeronautical engineering techniolgy principals. I suspect Larry
did if he designs his own R/C planes and doesn't buy them already
finished from Japan. IMHO R/C Model Airplanes as a hobby IS a
TECHNICAL HOBBY if the R/C hobbiest builds his or her own planes...If
not, it is just some level of playing with expensive toys, which any
kid can do if his daddy gives him the money required.

Yep individuals can be self-taught. Individuals can be hobby
communicators. Individuals can be experinmenters. Groups of
Individuals can "form a cadre of technical experts", who are at home
with the modern state of the art. The question is - Do those
individuals now see any reason to want to join the ranks of "dumbed
down" hams, whose leaders opine that Ham radio is not to be a Technical
Hobby?
Do those individuals believe that they can best spend their time using
media which requires no Ham license and pioneering in the technology of
those new media?

> > Sadly there will be no Ham Radio.
>
> Another unprovable assertation. However, we can put a small wager on
its
> being around at the end of 2009; would that be a reasonable time
frame over
> which to speculate?

Nope - It can linger on for another 50 years, if the FCC permits it to.
It may simply slowly fade away, like MacArthur's prioverbial "Old
Soldiers". During the fade out...The remaining few Hams may be
thought of as Old Codgers who are not willing to face any new
technologies unless it is spun off from the commercial rejects of
Chinese mass production. This I admit is a worse case scenario...but
if present attitudes prevail this is all that we can reasonably expect.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
Please don't let Ham Radio become Citizen's Multi-Band (CMB)!
73,
Hams need MORE license classes to make Ham Radio a modern TECHNICAL
HOBBY,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

The Ham of the future will not need the Morse code
but if he thinks that he will not need to learn
communication technology he will no longer be a Ham.
He will become a CMBer.
--w2ilp--

The individual Ham is defined as a Licensed Amateur
Radio Operator...BUT...Hams, as a group, must generally
conform to the same BASIS and PURPOSE that has been
consistently listed in Part 97. If they can not..then
Ham Radio must be redefined as CMB.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

99. Re: FCC TO DO AWAY WITH LICENSE REQUIREMENTS?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h6q65$k4o$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 99

In article <sjd5vp3n5ri146@corp.supernews.com>,
vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL) wrote:
> This wouldn't be very fair. Most post April 15th license candidates don't
> know who their daddy is. Of course, the League could step in and forge
> permission slips, and then give a membership discount to boot!
>
> mailfrmpa@aol.com (MailfrmPA) wrote in
> <20000529125623.22354.00000413@ng-cv1.aol.com>:
> >In their place will be Permission Slips, filled in and signed by Parent
> >or Legal Guardian, or other responsible Adult! Those without a
> >Permission Slip will not be allowed to go on the bands.
> >
> >Will HF be next??
> >
> >K&#65533;MB
> >

This reminds me of a story that I often tell. I once asked my college Communications class Professsor, "Why do I have to learn Fourier Transforms? I think that I could design an entire communications system without them." His answer was not very technical. He said "If your daddy was rich, you wouldn't have to learn anything."

W2ILP (Illegal Licensing Permission?)

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

100. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8h68o50er0@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 100

In article <20000601120647.19467.00000566@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...

>>>Prozak? What's that?
>>
>>Either you've been living in a cave for the past ten years, or you've taken
>>so
>>much Prozak that you've forgotten what it is.
>
>Hmmm. Well, I did a Lycos search on the string "Prosak," and I
>found things like "Prosak dunnage bags," and some doctors by
>that name, and a few other references. However, in this context,
>I believe you're referring to "Prosak" as some sort of medication...
>and I'm not getting anything like that.
>
>Now, there is an anti-depressant called "Prosac," but obviously,
>you wern't talking about that! Maybe if you took your Ritilin, your
>spelling would improve!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Like you, I used to berate people who made spelling errors, especially WA8ULX, who types as if he is wearing boxing gloves.

However, I came to realize that I make my share of spelling mistakes and typos as well. I proofread, but I'm only human, so on occasion there may be a typo or error that slips by. In this case, I relied on someone else's spelling in the hope that they where correct. Sometimes I'm wrong. Like I said, I'm only human.

I also realized that it's a very weak-minded individual who feels they have to resort to pointing out spelling errors. I don't do that anymore, even with someone who can't even type an intelligent sentence past a second grade level.

Tom - N8ECW

101. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: General Mark Morgan <one.big.asshole@ahole.com>
Message-ID: <3936D738.A06371D0@ahole.com>
Source record: 101

Is that all Cecil, 1 million bucks. I'm at 1.5 mil and by the time
I retire will have at least 3.75 mil. Not bad for a guy with only a
HS education.

W6RCecilA wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Cecil: If you're so smart, why aren't you a Post hole Digger?
>
> My goal was to retire with a million bucks.
> I didn't need a PhD for that.
> --
> 73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

102. Re: HF Sounds Great

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3936BB35.22149CA3@uci.edu>
Source record: 102

K0HB wrote:
> > >Please describe precisely, in the English language, the "downside"
> > >which results from that usage. If you cannot describe it, then it
> > >does not exist.

> > I have done so often. but to name a few points.

> Sorry, Major, you haven't described anything, or stated any
> facts. You've just expressed your opinion.

Here on the newsgroup, I described a couple "downsides" that I have encountered while operating CW. One related to trying to copy a bad fist (I heard a guy yesterday, sending CQ FISB :-), and the other involved two CW stations sending simultaneously on exactly the same frequency. Ed mentioned that he would be able to copy both, simulataneously if they were separated by 25 HZ or so. I though that was amazing. Maybe you have me in your killfile and you didn't see that exchange.

73, Jim AC6XG

73, Jim AC6XG

103. Re: U.S. Stamp Design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h6t9b$m1f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 103

In article <gWUT4.8966$ZE4.170387@ord-read.news.verio.net>,
"Marc A. Schneider, Psy.D." <drmarc@wwa.com> wrote:
> To all Hams ! ! ! !
>
> I have written to the U.S. Postal Service Stamp Design Committee to
request
> a U.S. Stamp be designed to commemorate Amateur Radio for the year
2003
> (100th anniversary). I also contacted the head of Public Relations
for ARRL
> (Jen. Hagy). I then wrote on 4-25-00 to the ARRL President Jim Haynie
> (e-mail: w5jbp@arrl.org). It took additional days for that message
to be
> received as the ARRL domain name had been corrupted that day. I have
yet to
> hear from the President of the ARRL on this matter. The organization
does
> have other things to do.
>
> I am writing here to request that other ARRL members write to create
enough
> grass roots presence on the issue for ARRL to be sure to address it
in a
> timely fashion. The Stamp Committee needs three years to get a stamp
out to
> the public. I believe that it is a good idea to have the ARRL as
part of
> the request to the Stamp Committee and I believe that requests from
various
> parts of the nation will also help. Since I have not gotten a reply
from
> Jim Haynie so far I am requesting all who read this to contact Jim
and to
> also write to the Stamp Committee as well as ask others on the air -
around
> the nation - to also do the same.
>
> The Stamp Committee address: - snail mail is:
>
> Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee
> U.S. Postal Service
> 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW
> Room 4474EB
> Washington, DC 20260-2437

>
> I will not be monitoring this newsgroup so any questions should go to
me via
> e-mail.
>
> 73 to all,
>
> Marc A. Schneider
> drmarc@wwa.com
> call sign: W4NVY
>
Dear Dr. Marc...

Let me remind you that a newsgroup is supposed to be a two [or more]-
way discussion group and not a broadcasting outlet. If you want to
broadcast then I suggest that you might look into setting up a web-
site...BUT if you want to discuss Ham Policy then be ready to monitor
for those who might want to reply to you - with the entire group
following the thread, if it is of interest to them. Besides if you
monitor the thread you might see that you have sent the same message a
number of times and might learn more about NGs. Sometimes I hit
the "Send (no preview)" button twice by mistake myself...BUT even I
don't send the same message as often as you did. I have been
criticised for echoing here and I can understand that this practice is
frowned on by experienced NGers. NGs are sort of like the Ham Bands.
You can't broadcast or talk to yourself without listening on them....At
any rate it is not considered polite to do so on either media. There
is no official law against it in a NG but there is on the Ham bands for
obvious reasons.
Just a humble suggestion that could lead to your using better
psychological NG judgement. At any rate I don't think that you would
want to give the impression that you would only monitor a NG that had
only PhD posters in it...or would you?
I'll send this message to you via e-mail. I won't send it by snail
mail because I don't want to buy any new postage stamps unless they
commemorate Ham Radio.

I will be monitoring this NG.
73 you all,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Itterated Letter Postage?)
BSEE MSEd (Not a PhD)

POST NO BILLS.
--?(Sign on a brick wall)--

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

104. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601155317.06296.00001297@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 104

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: billsohl@interactive.net (Bill Sohl)
>Date: 06/01/2000 12:34 PM Central Daylight Time

>r.r.a.p. sure has gone rather banal these days.<

THESE days...?!?!

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

105. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3936BF9E.914DD01C@uci.edu>
Source record: 105

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> BTW -- how come none of my nieces and nephews
> use that kind of language? I'll tell you why -- their parents, uncles,
> and aunts won't put up with it, and constantly send them the
> clear message that such language is totally unacceptable!

Hey Larry, if you think that just because they don't use it in front of
you means that they haven't heard it, or used it among their friends,
you are seriously deluding yourself. What they have learned is that
using bad language in front of adults is unacceptable.

73, Jim AC6XG

106. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000601160306.06296.00001299@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 106

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 06/01/2000 1:05 PM Central Daylight Time

>Well, if you don't know how many law-abiding gangs there are, you cannot possibly know whether there are more black gangs than white gangs.<

Do you really believe this, Cecil? Of course you can identify a reasonably confident number of one demographics against another.

And "law abiding gangs"...?!?!

Forget it, Cecil.

I thought you were on of the FEW posters of some character here...Guess you're a "character" alright.

Sorry to waste your time. Back to your bottle.

107. Re: U.S. Stamp Design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3937026F.D4478DB2@uci.edu>
Source record: 107

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> Dear Dr. Marc...

> Let me remind you that a newsgroup is supposed to be a two [or more]-
> way discussion group and not a broadcasting outlet. If you want to
> broadcast then I suggest that you might look into setting up a web-
> site...BUT if you want to discuss Ham Policy then be ready to monitor
> for those who might want to reply to you - with the entire group
> following the thread, if it is of interest to them.

Hey Bob,

Speak for yourself. Okay? I don't think there's pennance involved for
posting to r.r.a.p. He posted something interesting to read. Somewhat
of a novelty here, actually. And he asked for help for what I think is
a good sounding cause. It wasn't an anonymous post, which is certainly
a plus. It's just that the guy has better things to do than participate
in an argument clinic (TM). Good for him!

73, Jim AC6XG

Besides if you
> monitor the thread you might see that you have sent the same message a
> number of times and might learn more about NGs. Sometimes I hit
> the "Send (no preview)" button twice by mistake myself...BUT even I
> don't send the same message as often as you did. I have been
> criticised for echoing here and I can understand that this practice is
> frowned on by experienced NGers. NGs are sort of like the Ham Bands.
> You can't broadcast or talk to yourself without listening on them....At
> any rate it is not considered polite to do so on either media. There
> is no official law against it in a NG but there is on the Ham bands for
> obvious reasons.
> Just a humble suggestion that could lead to your using better
> psychological NG judgement. At any rate I don't think that you would
> want to give the impression that you would only monitor a NG that had
> only PhD posters in it...or would you?
> I'll send this message to you via e-mail. I won't send it by snail
> mail because I don't want to buy any new postage stamps unless they
> commemorate Ham Radio.
>
> I will be monitoring this NG.
> 73 you all,
> Bob Wex w2ilp (Itterated Letter Postage?)
> BSEE MSEd (Not a PhD)
> ---
> POST NO BILLS.

> --?(Sign on a brick wall)--
>
> Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
> Before you buy.

108. Re: Callsigns - was Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3937098D.72D99D50@uci.edu>
Source record: 108

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> I just may do that. I'll look for all suffixes, excluding vanity calls, issued
> in the past 5 years. If I can find at least one non-vanity call of each suffix
> and post that call here, will that satisfy you?

Sure, I guess so. As long as you provide an explanation, other than
lockout, for why all the others weren't issued.

> The fact that a call isn't issued is not evidence of a lock-out on that call -
> it could just as easily be abandoned within a month of issuance.....

It's a little soon for KF6TIT to have already disappeared from the
database - even if it had been "abandoned". Usually the database
indicates that a new call was issued in the event someone applied for a
change - a least for a few months. But QRZ CD's will tell the story.
Records don't disappear from them just because KF6TIT applies for a new
call.

By the way, how does one go about abandoning his callsign?

73, Jim AC6XG

109. Re: "Dirty Words" or why does Cecil sprew bull shit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <E08D7D2743C2A9D6.007922667877FBA9.B1065ACED98BAD6D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 109

I've been in Texas for 21 years. Only once I've seen a teeny rope tornado over in Ft. Worth. And when the season is hot around here (about five counties), I participate in storm spotting, then chasing into other counties. I have, though, seen the transformers blowing at night.

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"General Mark Morgan" <one.big.asshole@ahole.com> wrote in message news:393679BE.C351A732@ahole.com...
> Hey Cecil, you mean you live in Texas and have never been in a
> tornado? Been here 10 years and went through two.....
>
>

110. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <A15268F8ED6F96D0.FC72C5FB30485132.71D33EA1DC812640@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 110

GREAT point...exactly!!!!

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"T.L. Bryant" <tlbryant@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:8h5r5v12987@enews4.newsguy.com...
> In article <20000601055031.15983.00001820@nso-fk.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
says...
>
> <snippage deleted>
>
> >> If
> >>I say a tree *is* making noise in the woods, even if nothing is around
to
> >>hear it; you might say it does not.
> >
> >True.
> >
> >>That is not a contradiction. It is a
> >>difference of opinion.
> >
> >No, it's a contradiction. The thing to do is to check the premises - such
as
> >"what is 'noise'?"
> >>>
> >>> All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the
answers, in
> >>an
> >>> effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their
reasoning.
> >>If
> >>> their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.
> >>>
> >>
> >>I am near certain you aren't interested in other peoples' opinions.
>
> <more snippage deleted>
>
> This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
> argument.
>
> Tom - N8ECW
>

>

111. Re: Behind the scenes in the Walker Household.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <99CC5A5856E251CA.B93AEB0FFC515B8C.CAAD8EF13DF034B1@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 111

Slammed? Well, I guess you could say that. I think it's great! I laughed hysterically! I took it as just a really cute joke...and still do. But, no matter how you look at it, it's pretty darned funny!

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message news:sjd1bms25ri36@corp.supernews.com...
> I love it! TIT gets slammed!
>
> Woulff hong scores Big Time!
>
>
> integrity@arrl.sucks.org (Wouff Hong) wrote in
> <8h2bv1deh1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>:
> >
> >Kim's Husband: Dinner was great tonight hon, was that a new recipe?
> >
> >TIT: No, I just kept your TV-Dinner in the microwave a bit longer this
> >time.
> >
> >Kim's Husband: Oh, Thanks, you must have found the directions on the
> >package.
> >
> >TIT: When you're finished eating could you fix my 11 meter antenna? its
> >acting up again. I'm getting high SWR with the Linear in-line.
> >
> >Kim's Husband: Sure thing babe, maybe afterwards we could cuddle a
> >little.
> >
> >TIT: Wish I could, but I got to get back to my LID friends on
> >rec.radio.amateur.policy, we're trashing people who want to save ham
> >radio and they need my help.
> >
> >Kim's Husband: Sounds complicated.
> >
> >TIT: It is, but we have the help of my old high school sweetheart,
> >Cecil, and the backing of the ARRL in the person of Ed Hare. I think
> >we're making progress. There are quite a few others helping too.
> >
> >Kim's Husband: The toilet paper was all gone in the bathroom, so I had
> >to use a paper that came from the FCC.
> >

> >TIT: That's o.k., Ham Licenses are easy to get now. I hope you used the
> >backside. I had to use the frontside earlier.
> >
> >Kim's Husband: Yes, I saw where you left your mark. It's a bit lumpy
> >now, I hope you can get it back in the frame.
> >
> >TIT: I'll scrape it with a butter knife after I make a few posts.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>

112. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <39ADE3D726B96FC9.7814E372778AC3BD.A8034E8E4ED7F379@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 112

C'mon, Steve. Fer cryin' out loud. Everyone here is stating opinions.
Does each line of a post need to begin with, "In my opinion" for your
benefit? Good grief!!!!!!!!!!

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Steve Robeson" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20000601111151.04654.00001369@ng-ff1.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
> >From: W6RCecilA Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >Date: 06/01/2000 9:23 AM Central Daylight Time
>
> >Stating that I wouldn't be surprised if the majority of gangs were white
is
> the *absolute truth*<
>
> In this context there would have been no question as to the "source"
of
> your "information" or that this was an opinion, not a fact.
>

113. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <4BE66C46794F1A33.AFC3F4E3B621D287.D1EB2E091B2A8FDD@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 113

Ahem the PUD?? :))))

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Phil Kane" <nospam@nospam.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnarirevbznvypbz.fvhn9g3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 01 Jun 2000 11:41:47 -0700, Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > >
> > >Phil Kane wrote:
> > >
> > >> The only one that can add a C, C or R to property is a seller,
> > >> and they must be recorded the same as a deed.
> > >
> > >Can a seller similarly subtract provisions from a CC&R?
>
> In a Planned Unit Deveopment (the California term) all affected
> property owners in the PUD have to agree.
>
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

114. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-01 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <9213281C59297423.2607837260983BA3.7FA4C4F8AB31985D@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 114

Hey, Vince, have another shot, there fella......

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:sjd59j1q5ri119@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Be gentle with Ed, Larry. He's struggling with trying to balance what he
> knows is right on the inside with what the ARRL and the Whiner crowd want
> on the outside.
>
> Don't give in to the Dark-side "Luke". Oops, to late, Gotta keep the BoD
> happy to get a paycheck.
>
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
> <20000601004326.19467.00000432@nso-md.aol.com>:
>
> >In article <HUcZ4.23$d5.33043@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
> ><w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:
> >>What's this? You didn't prove your skill at flying by taking a test
> >>first? Does that mean that your flying accomplishments are not valid?
> >>:-)
> >>
> >
> >Ed:
> >
> >Flying radio controlled model airplanes does not require a license.
> >The transmitters used to operate under Part 95 and required a CB
> >license, but that requirement has been dropped; we now have
> >about 50 channels in the 72 - 75 MHz region. Don't know all the
> >technical details because I've been away from it for years. And
> >whether or not my flying accomplishments are "valid" is something
> >I could care less about. If some sort of licensing and testing for
> >a license were necessary, I would just do whatever was necessary
> >to pass the tests, then keyboard-slam all the lazy whiners who
> >didn't want to learn something useful to pass the tests! Any
> >other questions?
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>

115. Re: stamp design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h6v24$n4l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 115

In article <392F47DB.33C9@worldnet.att.net>,
wyn@worldnet.att.net wrote:
> Ed Hare, W1RFI wrote:
> >
>
> > I encourage hams to make their views known on all areas of Amateur
Radio to
> > their ARRL Division Director. This especially includes views of
support.
> > Dissenting views are often the League's most valuable input, but
sometimes
> > those fielding those views can really appreciate some positive
feedback,
> > too. :-)
> >
> > See http://www.arrl.org/divisions for info on how to contact ARRL
Division
> > Directors.
> >
>
> If there are any ARRL members left on here, let me suggest a better
> way. Take advantage of this electronic communication age, and contact
> your ARRL Division Director and ask him to give you his views on any
> aspect of amateur radio that you are interested in. As the poster was
> so careful to point out, when it came to the restructuring vote, the
> ARRL BoD voted *their* views, not necessarily *your* views. IMHO, if
> they had voted your predominate view it would have been Status Quo.
By
> your ARRL Division Director response to your query, you can determine
if
> yours 1) has a clue, 2) needs educating, 3) agrees with you - give
> him/her an attaboy/attagirl and a vote next election, or 4) disagrees
> with you - begin procedings to get him/her out of office. Lastly,
> encourage your BoD to send out questionaires canvasing their
> constituents on various upcoming issues.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

An excellent post Clay! The only trouble is that it has been my
experience that questionaires that get sent to ARRL members are very
poorly worded and are designed to get only the results that the
Directors want.
Often there is no way to logically select a logical opinion by checking

any box and no room to write comments that can't get counted and won't get read anyway.

BTW The ARRL isn't always wrong. They often do listen to members. Your comments will be taken seriously if you contact ARRL officers at various levels. My Division Director had proposed changing the name of the ARRL. When I wrote saying that IMHO the name should remain the same, and presenting lots of good reasons, he just continued to disagree. I then wrote to many other ARRL officers and the name changing proposal got defeated at an ARRL committee meeting (at least for the time being). I dunno for sure if it was may opinion that was considered but in all fairness they might have been thinking about some of my comments.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Ignore Logical Proposals???)

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

116. Re: How Long for Post April 15th License Processing?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10006020022170.138-100000@mbx.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 116

Well, 7 weeks, less two days, and I'm still waiting - yet someone else at the same test session had his upgrade granted by the FCC on May 3rd. The VE team didn't report any problems, and the VEC hasn't responded to either my phone or e-mail messages from last week - to see if my paperwork was lost. Oh, well.

[PS: I used a GLAARG group.]

117. Re: Callsigns - was Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10006020026090.138-100000@mbx.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 117

On Thu, 1 Jun 2000, Jim Kelley wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > On Fri, 26 May 2000, Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > N2EY was correct. The FCC has skipped those calls. Try UALR.
>
> > Unsubstantiated claim.
> > Real proof would be to obtain the FCC's "lockout file."
>
> It's called circumstantial evidence. The fact that the calls weren't
> issued indicates that they have been "locked-out". Would you care to
> prove otherwise?

I just may do that. I'll look for all suffixes, excluding vanity calls, issued in the past 5 years. If I can find at least one non-vanity call of each suffix and post that call here, will that satisfy you?

I do note that 2x3's with an "X" following the digit are not amateur calls (they are assigned to the experimental licenses), and calls with Q-Codes as the suffix (QRA-QUZ), plus "SOS" are skipped, but the original question is seeking "offensive" suffixes (such as "FUX", etc.); not those which are documented to be skipped.

The fact that a call isn't issued is not evidence of a lock-out on that call - it could just as easily be abandoned within a month of issuance.....

118. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601213407.19467.00000643@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 118

In article <3936A2EB.72367B1C@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> And why would I shoot you?
>
>Because you have threatened me with "ending up very
>much regretting" being me. The only way I would
>regret being me is if you shot me because I am
>being me.
>

Cecil:

Relax -- you have nothing to worry about! I wouldn't shoot
anyone, unless they were breaking into my apartment at
3 AM!

73 de Larry, K3LT

Senator Ted Kennedy has killed more people with his automobile
than I have with my guns.

***

119. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000601213408.19467.00000644@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 119

In article <2jBZ4.37$d5.46951@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>Sorry, Vince; it may offer you some comfort to think that, but I post only
>what I believe. If I didn't believe what I said, I could just as easily
>not post, and it would not affect my professional standing at ARRL one whit;
>I am not paid to post on rrap, I am paid to run the Lab, to work on RFI and
>to coordinate the Lab's technical input to ARRL publications, our
>spectrum-protection efforts and the like.
>

Ed:

OK, let's leave you out of this for a bit. If you know one person who
works at ARRL HQ, who is a licensed amateur, and is in complete
disagreement with the concept of restructuring, who is it? If you can't
or won't answer for privacy reasons, ask that person if he/she would
kindly post to this newsgroup voluntarily. I'll bet you a lobster dinner
you can't find anyone that is willing to do that. I firmly believe that
anyone who works for ARRL HQ is required to tow a strictly Pro-
Restructuring line -- and cannot, for fear of jeopardizing their
employment, speak out against it in any way. And I hereby state to
all in this newsgroup that it is highly unlikely that we'll ever see that
happen!

We all live in a democracy, but very few of us work in one. It is
perfectly normal, natural, and even legal for corporations or
organizations to require their employees and/or volunteer staff to
never speak out with an opinion which is contrary to the goals of
that organization. I have absolutely no doubt that ARRL HQ
exacts this kind of speech control, if not thought control, over
it's employees and volunteer staff. If anyone at ARRL HQ is
in absolute total, unqualified disagreement with Restructuring,
I'm sure a trap door has been installed under his chair --
ready to send him into a pit of hungry alligators the minute he
opens his mouth!

73 de Larry, K3LT

120. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Rickhit@worldnet.att.net
Message-ID: <39372ecd.162180430@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 120

On Mon, 29 May 2000 02:19:33 GMT, Gary Danaher <gdanaher@home.com>
wrote:

>Yes, it is embarrassing to the hobby. Even more so if she gets call
>plates on her car. I just wonder what would possess a woman to think so
>little of herself that she has the need to do this for the attention
>value.
>Gary
>AB5RM
>
>
Oh so what about Kim's call sign, are all of you that thin skinned
and upset over here call letters? It does not bother me one bit! In
fact if I heared her on the air I would definitely try to contact her.
For some one with a call sign like that I know that person would be
full of life. The rest of you people have to lighten up a little and
learn to enjoy life.

73 W5TIT de Rick KC2ESD

121. Re: stamp design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: billsohl@interactive.net
Message-ID: <3937320f.2164787@news.interactive.net>
Source record: 121

On Thu, 01 Jun 2000 16:25:42 GMT, vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus,
KB7ADL) wrote:

>Ed, how much is the BoD paying you per Post for spreading bullshit? They
>might quit paying you.
>
>Ed Hare, W1RFI the ARRL BoD propaganda machine, goofed and told a dirty
>BoD secret in response to n4aox:
>
>>Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>>
>>> Lastly, encourage your BoD to send out questionaires canvasing their
>>> constituents on various upcoming issues.
>
>They don't listen to what the membership wants Clay. The BoD has already
>ignored & screwed the membership over a year and a half ago in a big way.
>I guess what the ham community wanted wasn't in the vested interest of the
>corprate bank account.

And you know this because?
The details of how the BoD screwed the membership
is exactly what and how?

>>My director has done so on a number of occasions.
>>
>>Polling is NOT the best way to get member input, IMHO; issues are best
>>solved by those who have more vested interest than checking off a box
>>on a question they may or may not fully understand or may or may not be
>>very interested in.
>
>See Ed, what you wrote in the above paragraph proves my point. Why poll
>the membership when it might go against the vested interest of the BoD.
>Your screwed up BoD assholes have ignored the membership so many times I
>don't know why you continue to hold elections!

Maybe they just ignored you Vince...or are you
claiming you have, you know and you can state
with absolute certianty just what "the membership"
really wanted?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
ARRL LGL

122. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: W4CSC@lostonthe.net
Message-ID: <2AEDB30C51A3DD4D.FAA305D44A6D65E6.76085FD49403BE03@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 122

On Thu, 01 Jun 2000 09:46:16 -0700, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>
>
>
>> What "code test"? I didn't see no "code test".....(c;
>
>Yes, Larry, there is a code test. The FCC refers to it as Element 1.
>Stick around, you have much to learn. :-)
>
>73, Jim AC6XG

Which code?? ASCII? Pocsag? Forward Error Correction? Baudot?
PSK31? Gtor? Pactor? spread spectrum? TCP/IP? Rose? NetNode?
APRS? UDP? I wanna study for the TCP/UDP tests.....Oh, I'm already
ON TCP now!

Larry...all in good fun....beep....beep beep....Dahhhh...Beep Beep
Beep. What a waste of bandwidth, switching the transmitter on and
off.

123. List of the rec.radio newsgroups

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <8h7fh1$ik2$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 123
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Archive-name: radio/personal-brief-introduction

In an effort help ensure a poster's article reaches the appropriate
audience, below is a list of the rec.radio newsgroups. In most cases,
a group's name will explain its purpose. Cross-posting should rarely
be necessary.

rec.radio.broadcasting (devoted to the broadcast industry; moderated)
rec.radio.cb
rec.radio.info (periodic informational bulletins; moderated)
rec.radio.scanner
rec.radio.shortwave
rec.radio.swap (for buying, selling, and trading; not a discussion group)

rec.radio.amateur.antenna
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors (tube-type communications equipment)
rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc (packet, pactor and other digital modes)
rec.radio.amateur.dx (long-distance amateur communications)
rec.radio.amateur.equipment (questions, comments regarding commercially-
built amateur gear; not for buying/selling)
rec.radio.amateur.homebrew (devoted to home-building ham gear)
rec.radio.amateur.policy (issues include code, restructuring, local
restrictions in conflict with FCC R&R)
rec.radio.amateur.space (satellites, meteor scatter, EME)
rec.radio.amateur.misc (any amateur topic not covered in the above groups)

(At least two other English language radio hierarchies exist, prefixed
with "uk" (United Kingdom), and "aus" (Australia), in place of "rec.")

Again, cross-posting should rarely be necessary. Many times, a long-
running thread results from a single cross-posted article, and its
content drifts further and further away from being "on-topic" in the
various NGs which receive each and every followup.

For more detailed information, see "Guide to the Rec.radio Newsgroups"
posted on the 15th of each month.

Jeffrey Herman, KH6O
```

124. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Sycho_Graphics <Sycho_Graphics@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <#yD9qIFz$GA.321@cpmsnbbsa07>
Source record: 124
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Didn't try and I don't want to better places to spend my time and money. Who needs a damn test to operate a CONSUMER oriented electrical communication device in the 21st Century? I use a cellphone, GPS receiver, cordless phones, computers, TV, VCR (I can actually set it too :)), High-end Home Stereo remote, FRS devices, CB radio, Palm Pilot , RC cars and boats and even a microwave oven and I don't need a damn license for those. What makes HAM gear soooo complicated I need to pass a test and be TAXED on it by the FCC?

By the way Jim who the hell are you gonna MORSE with? Aliens, Russian SPY ships, the Space Shuttle, clandestine operatives so deep under cover that they can't afford voice transmission equipment (poor bastards). So, who the HELL do you Morse too in the 21st century??? MORSE is DEAD. dot dot dot dash dash dash dot dot blah blah blah HA HA HA :) :) :) You guys kill me.

Man you guys crack me up get with the times folks your HAM hobby is as OBSOLETE as my VIC-20 and C-64 are to 1Ghz CPU's. Let the FCC use the space for something more useful, at least more interesting. Hell I'd buy a GMRS unit once the FCC re-allocates frequencies, manufactures mass produce (a la FRS), drop the price and licensing bullshit. I can see a uses for a 5-10 mile communication device on UHF, FRS is neat but limited. Technology WILL not stand still for long, I would love said GMRS with built in GPS, terrain mapping database, hell throw a cellphone , scanner, personal organizer and MP3 in there too, sell for $300.00 - 500.00 sweet. The future looks good to me at least.

"Jim West" <Jim@jameswest.com> wrote in message
news:kspcjsktuf10186v06tks2d6tjhlf0ikk7@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 31 May 2000 11:23:28 -0400, "Sycho_Graphics"
> <Sycho_Graphics@email.msn.com> wrote:
>
> >In short, WHO CARES. Let the ignorant, self-centered, egotistical
basterds
> >all go away so I don't have to hear about how great HAM was in 1960 one
more
> >damn time. I think they are a joke, cops think they are a joke, most
local
> >authorities (In real cities not shit towns) think they are a joke, anyone
> >under the age of 30 thinks they are a joke, they are the only ones who
seem
> >to take themselves (way too) seriously. BYE, bye and good riddance.
>
> Couldn't pass the morse code test eh?
>

> >
> >
> >"me" <@.> wrote in message
> >news:1BC5AB4B06B6F8D8.AAC0E5EAFC5FA110.82C6E091ECEFDFD2@lp.airnews.net...
> >Funny. In 2 or so years there will be 200 hams.
> >Those 200 hams will still think there are alot of hams.
> >1 HAM is one ego and a waste of time too many (CW). :)
> >
> >
>

125. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <39376377.EC147D78@sccoast.net>
Source record: 125
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Sycho_Graphics wrote:
>
> <snip> Who needs a damn test to operate
> a CONSUMER oriented electrical
> communication device in the 21st
> Century? <snip>

Well, if you spent a little time learning about ham radio, you would
be able to answer your own question. For one thing, unlike the other
electronic devices you described, ham radio gives you the capability to
broadcast on multiple radio bands, using considerable output power, and
using several different operating modes. A computer, home stereo, tv,
cell phone, CB radio, or other similar devices, do not have any of those capabilities.

> Man you guys crack me up get with
> the times folks your HAM hobby is as
> OBSOLETE as my VIC-20 and C-64 are
> to 1Ghz CPU's. <snip>

There is a greater demand for radio, and ham radio, today then there
has ever been. The list of devices using radio, and agencies using
radio, has grown considerably, and will continue to grow in the future.
Therefore, the need for people with at least basic radio skills is also growing.

> <snip> Hell I'd buy a GMRS unit once the
> FCC re-allocates frequencies, manufactures
> mass produce (a la FRS), drop the price
> and licensing bullshit. I can see a uses
> for a 5-10 mile communication device on
> UHF, FRS is neat but limited. <snip>

Don't hold you breath.

> <snip> I would love said GMRS with built
> in GPS, terrain mapping database, hell
> throw a cellphone , scanner, personal
> organizer and MP3 in there too, sell
> for $300.00 - 500.00 sweet. <snip>

Like I said, don't hold your breath.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

126. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602043317.18766.00002106@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 126

In article <77A3DB1A95D1375B.B98CCD3CDCBAE988.EA8EFD0934B0030A@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>> >I don't think there's a contradiction.
>>
>> Of course you don't. That's why you don't like it when I point them out.
>
>I haven't seen a contradiction yet.

Of course not. If you did see them, I wouldn't have to point them out.

> I find your observation that you think
>I don't "like" something you've posted, quite interesting.

Fascinating.

> The only
>"feeling" I have about your posts is that our communication is nothing short
>of a viciuos circle.

Why do you feel that way? Because I won't agree with you?

>You may have time for that, but I do not.

Yet you have time for literally thousands of posts here.
>>
>> >That is not a contradiction. It is a
>> >difference of opinion.
>>
>> No, it's a contradiction. The thing to do is to check the premises - such
>as
>> "what is 'noise'?"
>
>The first part of the scenario on that is the science of it. All else is
>opinion, philosophy, etc.

Definitions, too. The point is that it's not just an opinion question.

In fact, the "tree falls in a forest" thing has no opinion component at all if
it's done logically.
>
>> >> All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the answers,
>in an
>> >> effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their
>reasoning. If
>> >> their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.
>> >>

>And, that, dear Jim, is your opinion.

Not just that. Logic and reasoning exist independently of opinion. A statement may be true or false. An opinion may be valid or invalid.

For example, a person may claim that Blatz beer is the best in the world. That's an opinion, of course. But unless that person has actually tried every beer in the world, it's an invalid opinion. Or perhaps you'd prefer the phrase "unsupported by facts or experience". In either case, someone can logically argue that Blatz is NOT the best beer in the world, and the claimant doesn't have a logical leg to stand on.

But if a person claims that Blatz beer is the best that person has ever tried, that opinion is valid. Or perhaps you'd prefer the phrase "supported by facts or experience". Either way, there isn't much to argue against.

>But, you accept it as fact for yourself.

No, I present it as fact. Period.
>> >
>> >I am near certain you aren't interested in other peoples' opinions.
>>
>> You are completely mistaken about that. I'm greatly interested in other
>> people's opinions. That does not mean I always agree with them or adopt
>them as
>> my own. I only do that when another's opinion is based on sound
>reasoning.
>
>Being interested in another person's opinions has nothing to do with whether
>you agree with them or "adopt" them as your own. It has to do with finding
>an interest in the aspect of another person's view, *without* regard to
>those things!!

Agreed. I have an interest in the aspect of your view. That's why all the questions.

> I didn't realize that we were trying to win friends and
>influence people. If I'd known such a thing, I'd have not let you see my
>*real* thoughts.

So you think that winning friends and influencing people requires deception? Sounds like it.
>
>> I'm even more interested in relevant facts, such as those posted by
>> knowledgeable folks like Phil Kane.
>
>Then, initiate dialogue with Phil

I have. He's a tremendous resource. Too bad you don't accept his word on some things - things that he knows about first hand.

> and quit wasting your time asking me your
>irrelevant questions.

All of my questions are quite relevant.
>
>> >I am
>> >absolutely certain I am not interested in yours.
>>
>> That's quite obvious. Your motives in posting here are quite different
>from
>> mine. Just as your motives in callsign choice are different than mine.
>
>There ya go....let's get right back full circle, eh?

> You don't like my callsign,

I don't think callsigns of that particular type help the ARS. I think the ARS would be better off if all hams voluntarily avoided them.

>and that has been the total motivation for your posts and dialogue
>here with me.

Nope. You're totally mistaken about that.

>You aren't interested in my opinion, you could care less.

Not true at all. I'm very interested in your opinion. See below.

>You *are* interested in maintaining a dialogue that publicizes your
>displeasure with my callsign.

Have I said, before this post, whether I "like" or "dislike" your call? Nope.

> Thank you for proving my point.

Thank you for proving mine.

You see, when you first showed up on this NG, I thought that the callsign had to be fake - a joke. Lots of anonymous posters here, as you can see. So I checked out qrz.com, and found out it was for real! Did some paging through the callbooks, and found that there had been a W6 version since at least 1979. So the FCC would issue such a call - but apparently only on request, because there exist no others.

Now the whole vanity call thing goes back decades. I've had this call since 1977, but I got it at random, because in that timeframe the FCC didn't let you pick and choose. Since then, the vanity call program has been greatly expanded, and lots of folks have gotten all sorts of calls based on their initials, names, etc. Usually they are strictly G-rated.

But your suffix doesn't fit the G rating. You admit that when you say you won't say the word on the air.

So I began to wonder what sort of thought process would lead someone to request such a call. You say it was a dare, because a friend didn't believe the FCC would issue such a call. Logically, all that was needed to win that dare was to look in any callbook or database since 1979 and see the W6 version. If even one such call exists, then obviously the FCC would issue such calls, somehow.

All of the dialogue has been to try to figure out what sort of though process would lead someone to request and hold such a callsign, since it is obviously offensive to a good percentage of the amateur radio community. Your responses have convinced me that you think that since YOU don't find your callsign offensive, there's no reason for you not to have it. Regardless of anyone else's opinion, how it looks to nonhams, etc. In other words, if it makes Kim happy, it's gotta be good.
>
>> It's interesting to note that you want to express an opinion about
>practically
>> everything said here, and to examine the opinions, motives and actions of
>> others but do NOT want your opinions, motives and actions to be examined
>by
>> others. Classic double standard.
>
>I have no problem at all with debating opinions.
> I'd say the double
>standard is in your stating that you wish to debate, but more wish to
>condemn through your debate.

What have I "condemned"? Nothing.

> See? It's all in perspective and opinion...

No, it isn't. The idea that all opinions, value systems and viewpoints are equally valid is one of the great mistakes of our time.

>:) PS--I wouldn't spend so much time being mad at someone for their choice
>of callsign, either.

Nor would I. I'm not angry at all. You appear to be, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

127. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602043318.18766.00002107@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 127

In article <8h5r5v12987@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant)
writes:

>In article <20000601055031.15983.00001820@nso-fk.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>says...
>
><snippage deleted>
>
>>> If
>>>I say a tree *is* making noise in the woods, even if nothing is around to
>>>hear it; you might say it does not.
>>
>>True.
>>
>>>That is not a contradiction. It is a
>>>difference of opinion.
>>
>>No, it's a contradiction. The thing to do is to check the premises - such as
>>"what is 'noise'?"
>>>>
>>>> All I'm doing is asking simple questions and commenting on the answers,
>in
>>>an
>>>> effort to discover people's opinions on the subject, and their reasoning.
>>>If
>>>> their reasoning appears to be faulty, I point that out.
>>>>
>>>
>>>I am near certain you aren't interested in other peoples' opinions.
>
><more snippage deleted>
>
>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
>argument.
>
No it doesn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

128. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602043319.18766.00002108@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 128

In article <yoBZ4.38$d5.47788@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>>> How about a lobster dinner, payable the next time one of us in the
>>> other's area.
>
>> Hey! That's MY bet!
>
>Yeah, but it's MY trademark! :-)

Ayeh.
>
>> "Everybody wants to get into the act" - Jimmy Durante
>
>Agreed. :-)

"I got a million of 'em"
>
>> You get near EPA, Ed, lemme know, we'll do the lobster dinner thing
>> without a bet.
>
>Well, I was just in Allentown --- paying up on a lobster-dinner bet.

Only about 40 miles from here. btw, this new QTH needs a name. Old place (in
Upper Darby, former home of B&W) was called RadioTelegraph Hill. This place
(Radnor Township, within earshot of the Devon Horse Show) is still nameless
after 7 months. Perhaps South Selden Hill? Or maybe Southgate Manor?

>WA6VSE said it was the best-tasting lobster he has had in a while. :-)

Then he's never been to Maine, where the good ones are. Like Buffalo (actually,
Tonawanda) is the place for wings. Amd beef on a weck.
>
>> > Add to it the shrimp cocktail, that the number of licensed US
>> amateurs on
>> > 2/28/2001 will be higher than it is on 12/31/2000.
>
>> Don't you mean 12/31/1999?
>
>Yes, I did, but I will take it either way. :-)

I wish I could get a piece of that action. Heck, the backlog of the past six
weeks alone will bust 680K. And the trickledown effect hasn't really kicked in
yet.

>
>> > > One thing that I know would spur interest, at least on the UHF
>> bands,
>> > > would be a decent low-cost, hi-speed(>56Kbps) digital radio. If we
>> see
>> > > such an animal in the near future, numbers will start to increase,
>> > > instead of decrease.
>
>> Maybe. What would folks DO with such a rig that they cannot do now with
>> 9600 baud packet?
>
>The funny part is that I agree with Stew about much of the technical things
>he posts, although I don't think that such "high-speed" digital radio is the
>only thing that will attract youth to ham radio.

Agreed.

>Tekk has made a 38.8kbs
>digital radio for years; I don't think jumping to 56 kb would make a
>tremendous difference.

The end user rig is only one of many problems to be solved in order to have
what he proposes.

>But agreeing in principle doesn't mean that I think
>we need to predict the end-of-amateur-radio-as we know it; I think the point
>that Amateur Radio needs to encompass more technically than it does right
>now stands well on its own.

Agreed! The question is - how to get there? The QST/QEX split of years ago puts
most of the serious tech stuff in QEX. That's not a bad thing - one of the
chronic complaints about QST before the QEX days was "it's too technical".

73 de Jim, N2EY

129. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602043319.18766.00002109@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 129

In article <03d094ee.d37c7a9f@usw-ex0106-046.remarq.com>, horseshoe7
<horseshoe7NOhoSPAM@yahoo.com.invalid> writes:

>In article <8h5n4esko1@nnrp1.deja.com>, n2ey@aol.com wrote:
>
>>> > One thing that I know would spur interest, at least on the
>UHF
>>bands,
>>> > would be a decent low-cost, hi-speed(>56Kbps) digital radio.
> If we
>>see
>>> > such an animal in the near future, numbers will start to
>increase,
>>> > instead of decrease.
>>
>>Maybe. What would folks DO with such a rig that they cannot do
>now with
>>9600 baud packet?
>
>Access newsgroups like this one - at a decent clip.

OK - but all that does is duplicate what they probably have already. And such a dataradio is only a small part of what's needed - there has to be some sort of gateway to Usenet in order to have a working system.

>At 9600bps,
>it is too slow. Dialup Internet didn't really start to boom
>until folks were able to get to 28.8Kbps. And nowadays
>56Kbps(with typical connections at about 48Kbps) is considered
>the minimally-acceptable speed.

Faster is better, sure. But millions of folks are still happily running 28.8 or even 14.4, because of phoneline limitations. For plain text, the difference is not THAT great. Where things bog down is with graphics and scripts and stuff like that, all being downloaded at once.
>
>At 115-500Kbps, we would actually leap-frog the dialup folks and
>be competitive with the DSL/cable modem crowd.

For a while. Fiber optics - that's the future. Soon the term "cable" will be as much a misnomer as "cut a tape". Many cable TV operations are already partly fiber.

>Note that I'm
>talking competitive in the sense of access speed only. Our
>data content would be different - I think that it would actually

>be superior to the untamed Internet, in many ways(no
>advertising(except ham gear!), no profanity,
>technically-oriented).

All of which is prohibited by law, of course. But there's the hitch: What you will get is not internet access, nor the web, nor even usenet or plain old email. Right there, a lot of the audience disappears. Worse, though, is the need for hams to build and maintain the backbone network. That's the "who'll bell the cat" problem. With no commercial content, there's no revenue generation to fund anything.

Fact is, a highspeed national digital network using UHF ham radio has been technically possible for at least 15-18 years. The problem is cost. How many nodes would such a network need, and who is going to build, maintain and coordinate them?

The answer, I think, is some sort of universal digital protocol and network that can do voice, data, text, image, whatever, so that the same network can handle amateur email, realtime voice and text, newsgroups like this one, and lots more. But that's a BIG order. Takes a lot more than a cheap dataradio to do that one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

130. Re: Callsigns - was Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <8h863gflr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 130

In article <Pine.LNX.4.10.10006020026090.138-100000@mbx.bde-arc.ampr.org>, kd6lvw@att.net wrote:> > > On Fri, 26 May 2000, Jim Kelley wrote:
> On Thu, 1 Jun 2000, Jim Kelley wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" wrote:

> > > > N2EY was correct. The FCC has skipped those calls. Try UALR.
> > >
> > > > Unsubstantiated claim.
> > > > Real proof would be to obtain the FCC's "lockout file."
> > >
> > > It's called circumstantial evidence. The fact that the calls weren't
> > > issued indicates that they have been "locked-out". Would you care to
> > > prove otherwise?
> >
> > I just may do that. I'll look for all suffixes, excluding vanity calls, issued
> > in the past 5 years. If I can find at least one non-vanity call of each suffix
> > and post that call here, will that satisfy you?

Sounds reasonable - but how can you tell whether a call was a vanity issue or a routine, next-in-alphabetical order issue?
>
> I do note that 2x3's with an "X" following the digit are not amateur calls
> (they are assigned to the experimental licenses), and calls with Q-Codes as the
> suffix (QRA-QUZ), plus "SOS" are skipped, but the original question is seeking
> "offensive" suffixes (such as "FUX", etc.); not those which are documented to
> be skipped.

Agreed.
>
> The fact that a call isn't issued is not evidence of a lock-out on that call -
> it could just as easily be abandoned within a month of issuance.....
>
Possibly. But there's a third possibility: The FCC may have set up the system so that certain calls and suffixes will not be routinely issued because the vast majority of recipients may not like them (e.g., AH0LE,

WH0RE). However, they will be issued if specifically requested as vanity calls. The suffix debated here at interminable length is obviously not routinely issued, because only the W6, W5 and K5 versions have been know to exist in the past 21 years - and the owner of the K5 version traded it for another K5 call. The W5 version is a recent vanity issue, but the W6 version is listed as far back as 1979 - and it may go back even farther. (1979 was the oldest callbook I had, and I just sold it).

Oddly enough, the suffix "LID" has been issued routinely in the past. Also, I have heard that the FCC will assign a new call without charge if a licensee thinks their sequentially issued callsign to be objectionable (for a reasonable cause).

73 de Jim, N2EY (sequentially issued in 1977)
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

131. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <8h87stgpo1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 131
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <8h1rav$9vn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
p1415926535@yahoo.com wrote:
> In article <delW4.21042$S31.454241@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
> "zincplaterubberant" <kru7dso@cir43a.org> wrote:
> [...]
> > While you are correct on your above observation, the greater
> > reason is our years and years of hanging onto an outdated
> > mode called CW. Today the American Retentive Radio Luddites
> > are running scared. Their membership is truly dying off
> > to the tune of an average of 55 US hams per month. Don't believe
> > this? Go to the library or your stacks of QST and check the
> > numbers in the SK listings for the past 8-12 months.
> >
>
> Only 55 US hams die per month? No, I don't believe that.

Me neither.
>
> Considering that the current US ham population is several
> hundred thousand (what is it now, about 600,000?), if the
> statistics for hams is similar to the general population there
> should be several times that many dying per month.
>
678,000, give or take a few.

Let's do some really crude estimates. Let's say the "average" ham
"career" lasts 50 years, and that almost all hams keep their licenses
till they pass away. (Note the word "average"). Then we can expect 2%
of the ARS to expire per year, or 0.167% per month. 0.167% of 678,000
is about 1132 per month.

> Or did you just mean ARRL members? That number still sounds
> too low.

Correct! Assuming 1 in 4 US hams is an ARRL member, we get 283 per
month.
>
> OTOH, if hams only die at the rate of 55/month we could promote
> amateur radio just on its health benefits. :-)
>
Yup!

One thing I've not seen yet is a breakdown of ARS licensees by age, and
comparisons with the US population as a whole. We see single number
"average age" stats, but they are meaningless without more detail. And

a correction factor must be included to allow for the fact that there are few hams under the age of about 10.

73 de Jim, N2EY (age 46, licensed since age 13, very much alive and kicking)

FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

132. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h8c8kjqj1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 132
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <8gclob$u6d$1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>,
"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> T.L. Bryant <tlbryant@my-deja.com> took another step toward USENET history
> by writing in part:
>
> > The question asked time and again is, "Why are there no *young* newcomers
> to
> > ham radio?" The answer is quite simple: elitism.

Elitism may be only a part of it. The largest so called generation "gap" occurred during the 60s when the youth of the USA took on a new culture that was opposed to the Viet Nam war and opposed to a lot of the conservative thinking of the older generation who fought in WW2. The result was the development of rebellous anti-government youth who sometimes went as far as becoming part of the druggie scene. Their rationalization for their anti-social behavior was based at least in part by their discovery of government hypocracy such as the Watergate affair. Hams have (inspite of some bigoted wizards) always represented a conservative group which is patriotic and loyal to our government. This has led to the continuation of what started as a "generation gap". IMHO that gap is getting bigger as time goes on. The gap is recognizable in the types of music and sadistic entertainmemt that polarizes the young vs the old culture. Unfortunately Ham Radio is seen, even by many Hams, as a part of the OLD CULTURE. This in itself makes it very hard to sell to the younger generation. on the other hand the freedom of speech that we see on the internet and even in this NG is not typical of trasditional Ham Radio content. Most Hams do not want to discuss sex, religion or politics over the air. (These subjects are taboo since Ham Radio content must be G rated)...BUT some will in NGs. This leaves Ham Radio a dry and sterile field as far as most youths are concerned. In short it offers no exciting surprises as far as its content goes.

> >
> > The elitist mentality fosters itself when a group of people think that
> they're
> > doing something "better" than someone else. It's not limited to one
> individual
> > group. It's a disease that infects Christian fundamentalists, as well as

> > teenagers who think they're "alternative". (You know the type. They
walk
> into a
> > CD store, sporting spiked, purple hair and facial piercings, and
complain
> > because the store doesn't have the entire discography of some
obscure band
> from
> > San Francisco who call themselves Blood Monster Mushrooms.)

I agree.

> D00d, BMM sucked out loud after their first album, making your
argument
> impotent.
>
> > This elitism makes the group irrational. The dangers of the elitist
> mindset are
> > very real. First, it more than likely creates hypocrites out of the
people
> > involved.

IMHO Hams who are technically innovative do have some qualities to
feel "elite" about...just as hacker gurus may. If Hams can feel that
Ham Radio has some bragging value then there can be no motive for most
people to become Hams.
> "I don't practice what I preach because I'm not the kind of person I'm
> preaching to." - J. R. "Bob" Dobbs

A very good quote. It applies to me as well.

> > Second, it annihilates the appeal of the group's philosophy, as no
> > one likes to be talked down to. Third, it turns the group into
general
> > assholes, making them snobby, confrontatinal, and unlikeable.

Yep...You can't talk down to a non-captive audience for long. Captive
audiences include only those in required school classes, court rooms,
military posts and unfortunate enough to be inside of a moving vehicle
where a loquatious speaker is propounding. Peopl;e and especially
youths don't want to be talked down to...even by their own parents.
BUT
IMHO you don't have to talk down or be talked down to to be an ass-hole.
Ass-holeism comes with a much larger field of territory.

> Not true!
>
> > I've seen this attitude time and again in ham radio. It's seen in
club
> > meetings, at hamfests, on the air, and most prevalently on the
internet.
>

> SHUT UP NAZI! Oops, sorry, reflex action.

Again we see the poster that seeks to analyze society being labelled a Nazi. In my cast I would probably get labled a Leftist for agreeing about the same social conditions.
> > My
> > idea of ham radio would be a wide range of individuals discussing many
> > different topics, and engaging in a meaningful and intelligent exchange of
> > information. (That certainly doesn't happen on the typical DX contact)
I would suggest that you take an IQ test and join Mensa. Then you could talk to intelligent people via Mensan NGs. Unfortunately you might find that these is little difference in the responses that you will get from the Mensans and the folks in this ham policy NG. A lot of smart people don't know how to communicate productively. Humans tend to do things and say things to satisfy their own egos when they are doing things that don't involve a monetary profit motive.. This is basic human nature.
> However,
> > that's asking for a Utopia that just isn't going to happen. Some will even
> say
> > that this is against the fundamental purpose of the service as outlined in
> Part
> > 97.1. These people can't even see past a rulebook to see that amateur
Yep...This is the traditional conservative nature of the hobby and has not changed with the changing American social culture.
> radio has
> > become stagnant.
>
> 97.1 does not prohibit these discussions. But talk about something the
> least bit controversial, and the jammers will pile on. It's not just ham
> radio.
Now you can understand my point of view. I believe that Ham Radio should be primarily a TECHNICAL HOBBY. It has always been accepted that Hams can discuss radio technology, their equipment, antennas, etc. If we go to far in thinking that Hams like CBers and NG posters can be permitted to discuss anything that they feel like we are changing a basic Ham tradition that has set Hams apart from other communications users in the past and IMHO must continue to do so...Not just so Hams can feel elite but so they can learn technology and pioneer in modern innovation which can approach the state of the art.

>Intolerance of other views is on the upswing everywhere. I dare say
> that if cancelling others' usenet posts was easier, most messages

would
> never appear. It's an attitude of "you're not just wrong, but evil."
After a
> while, fatigue sets in and people don't care. Hayul, the 3945 bunch
gets
> jammed when they mostly talk about RADIO!

It is too bad that bigots and extremists often can not respect their
opponents...BUT that is the very nature of their definition.

> > But, no. The majority of hams today are old and/or obese, white,
males who
> have

I'm old and white but not quite obese.

> > nothing better to do than talk about the "good 'ol days", their
health
> > problems, and the weather.
> >
Yeah about the RADIO technology in the good ol' days, how weather
effects RADIO propagation and how RADIO radiation might effect heaslth.
>
> Old. Obese. White. Male. Hey, where's the love?
>
Love is a many splendive thing...made firm by Viagra.

> > Based on these facts, you can see that the new license structure
isn't
> going to
> > save ham radio. A lower code test requirement isn't going to save
ham
> radio.
> > Only a change of attitude will save ham radio.

AGREED!!!

> Donating an FT-1000 to Unclaimed Mysteries is good first step, IMHO.
>
> > Until a redefining of the basis
> > and purpose

There can never be a basis and purpose to redefine our basis and
purpose. If you analyze which paragraphs need to be changed you can
only see an elimination of those very paragraphs with nothing real to
replace them...and thus an end to what are defined as the very basic
values of Ham Radio.

> happens, and until the poisonous elitism is purged, the appeal
> of
> > the internet for the free and open exchange of ideas will continue
to
> grow, and

> > interest in ham radio will continue to dwindle until it is like the
dead
> > languages of Europe: Still there for the curious, but of no common
use.

Very good analogy.

> There is no need for a 100% overlap between the net and amateur
radio. I'm
> frustrated with the stagnation too. But sometimes you just gotta make
your
> own fun. Heard 14.070 lately?

Maybe we need more Ham humorists who know some clean jokes that won't
offend anybody. Nah...They wouldn't be very funny.

> --
> It came from C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
> http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net/
> Public school all the way, bay-bee. So much for "socialization."
>
The public needs public schools...AND
Hams need more license classes,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Inspire Learning Public)

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

133. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3937AA4D.ABA23123@arrl.org>
Source record: 133
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

n2ey@aol.com wrote:
>
> One thing I've not seen yet is a breakdown of ARS licensees by age, and
> comparisons with the US population as a whole.

You can do that using the December 1996 data, but the FCC hasn't been collecting or publishing birth dates since that time so a breakdown by age of the current ham population isn't readily available.

Jon, KE3Z

134. Re: U.S. Stamp Design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h8dtf$l56$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 134

In article <3937026F.D4478DB2@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
>
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> > Dear Dr. Marc...
>
> > Let me remind you that a newsgroup is supposed to be a two [or
more]-
> > way discussion group and not a broadcasting outlet. If you want to
> > broadcast then I suggest that you might look into setting up a web-
> > site...BUT if you want to discuss Ham Policy then be ready to
monitor
> > for those who might want to reply to you - with the entire group
> > following the thread, if it is of interest to them.
>
> Hey Bob,
>
> Speak for yourself. Okay? I don't think there's pennance involved
for
> posting to r.r.a.p. He posted something interesting to read.
Somewhat
> of a novelty here, actually. And he asked for help for what I think
is
> a good sounding cause. It wasn't an anonymous post, which is
certainly
> a plus. It's just that the guy has better things to do than
participate
> in an argument clinic (TM). Good for him!
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG
>
> Besides if you
> > monitor the thread you might see that you have sent the same
message a
> > number of times and might learn more about NGs. Sometimes I hit
> > the "Send (no preview)" button twice by mistake myself...BUT even I
> > don't send the same message as often as you did. I have been
> > criticised for echoing here and I can understand that this practice
is
> > frowned on by experienced NGers. NGs are sort of like the Ham Bands.
> > You can't broadcast or talk to yourself without listening on
them....At
> > any rate it is not considered polite to do so on either media.

There
> > is no official law against it in a NG but there is on the Ham bands
for
> > obvious reasons.
> > Just a humble suggestion that could lead to your using better
> > psychological NG judgement. At any rate I don't think that you
would
> > want to give the impression that you would only monitor a NG that
had
> > only PhD posters in it...or would you?
> > I'll send this message to you via e-mail. I won't send it by
snail
> > mail because I don't want to buy any new postage stamps unless they
> > commemorate Ham Radio.
> >
> > I will be monitoring this NG.
> > 73 you all,
> > Bob Wex w2ilp (Itterated Letter Postage?)
> > BSEE MSEd (Not a PhD)
> > ---
> > POST NO BILLS.
> > --?(Sign on a brick wall)--
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
> > Before you buy.

I must appoligize to all for my above post. Jim is correct to call me
a hyp[ocrite. I got ticked off when I read Dr. Marc's statement that
he would not monitor this NG. I saw this as a "talk down" to the
posters of this group. I wondered if Dr. Marc only intended to monitor
groups of certified PhDs. Apparently he did monitor this NG, as he did
reply to others who commented in this thread. I also though that he
seemed to be an elitist who flashed his PhPsyc at us even in the
subject box, when IMHO his call-sign alone would do as far as this NG
is primarily concerned. I responded with my BSEE and MSEd, with a
competive defensive motive...but it was hypocritical to do so...and I
am sure that others might see me as a phony elitist. I would prefer
that they think of me as just another ham...(even tho being a Ham these
days might be like being an honorary idiot).
I won't send Dr. Marc an e-mail message because I suspect that he
IS monitoring this group in spite of his original disclaimer.
73,
Call sign: W2ILP (I Lack PhD)

Psychologist I: Hello.
Psychologist II: I wonder what he meant by that.
--?--

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

135. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602092243.14161.00001471@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 135

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: "Kim W5TIT" kw5tit@hotmail.com
>Date: 06/01/2000 10:08 PM Central Daylight Time

>C'mon, Steve. Fer cryin' out loud. Everyone here is stating opinions. Does each line of a post need to begin with, "In my opinion" for your benefit? Good grief!!!!!!!!!!<

Nothing has to be done "for (my) benefit", Kim, but when someone asks you for the source of your information on something you have stated, then you should either be able to say (or words to this effect) "It was just my opinion..." or "I got my information from..."

Cecil, like one or two others here, has gone to great lengths to impress us with, among other things, his IQ, professional associations and MENSA membership.

Anyone who TRULY has all three of those in his/her CV OUGHT to know how to formulate a sentence in such a way as to indicate that the information is based on a known fact or published data, or just an opinion with no verifiable facts.

Instead, Cecil went on the Internet version of a Texas Two-step around answering my inquiry as to his source of "facts". He finally admitted that this was just his opinion, based on nothing but a very limited scope of personal experience...ie his "all white motorcycle gang".

I don't buy into this concept that "just because" this is USENET, any abortion of the English language should be tolerated. We all were (supposed) to hae received a minimal education, and part of that education was to ensure that we can intercommunicate effectively.

Futhermore, I don't buy YOUR assertion that everyone here is just "stating opinions". The manner in which any given sentence is formulated determine wether the sentence is an opinion or stated as a given fact. Cecil would have us beleive that HIS opinions ARE fact.

Cecil likes to make assertions that he would like for us to accept as fact, yet is unwilling to substantiate those assertions. THAT'S propaganda!

We were all (supposedly) educated to a minimal level of comprehension of the English language. Those basic skills are essential so that we can all speak from a common frame of reference.

Ever read George Orwell's "1984", Kim ? If not, you ought to some time. It will give you a whole new outlook on the Internet in general and USENET in particular.

Perhaps THEN you might understand my penchant for SOME standards of grammar and structure.

Steve

136. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: General Mark Morgan <one.big.asshole@ahole.com>
Message-ID: <3937D1DE.4ADD2046@ahole.com>
Source record: 136

With the way the market is now it is a good time to invest into
communications companies... Good luck and hope you are enjoying
retirement.

W6RCecilA wrote:
>
> General Mark Morgan wrote:
> > Is that all Cecil, 1 million bucks. I'm at 1.5 mil and by the time
> > I retire will have at least 3.75 mil. Not bad for a guy with only a
> > HS education.
>
> I've been considering playing the index options market.
> Seems there is money to be made on the present roller
> coaster swings.
> --
> 73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

137. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602092557.14161.00001472@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 137

>Subject: Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 06/02/2000 2:34 AM Central Daylight Time

>Well, if you spent a little time learning about ham radio, you would be able to answer your own question.<

I think this person knows Amateur Radio very well, Dwight. S/he is just an antagonist. A well known one, at that.

Steve

138. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8h8g3tmuh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 138

In article <39307fc3.34483875@news.scottsbluff.net>,
ki7rw@arrl.net (Lee Roberts) wrote:
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> http://www.usatoday.com/news/acovfri.htm
>
> Boy, this article sure hits the nail on the head. I've been wondering
> about this for years! It can be applied to any situation, including
> Amateur radio.

I certainly respect all that the US and allied fighting forces did to
preserve our nation during WW2. There is nobody with any manners who
does not feel the same way....
BUT
The educated youth of today might not believe all that is said of the
gallent WW2 heros. After all kids are now being taught: -
1) That Columbus didn't discover America.
2) That Washington didn't cross the Delaware.
3) That Lincoln didn't intend to free the slaves.
4) That Oswald didn't act alone.
5) That Sarnoff didn't work the Titanic.

People today are skeptical about anything...ever Ham Radio. People do
need to see the bloody bandages of WW2, if only in museums, to prove
that wars are hell.

It is very bad manners to show disrespect for the heros of the
past...but unfortunately when the accurate facts get reported, people
now tend to get skeptical about everything...even our President's
fidelity....which IMHO shows that people have no respect. Yes... People
with bad manners show no respect and people who show no respect have
bad manners.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (I Like Patriots)
Did you ever doubt?

Signature not encoded. I am not elitist enough to think that anyone
would care to imitate me.

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

139. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602095829.14063.00001385@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 139

>Subject: Re: Ham radio's downward trend
>From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
>Date: 06/02/2000 8:19 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <8h8c8k$jqj

>> T.L. Bryant <tlbryant@my-deja.com> took another step toward USENET history
by writing in part:
>> > The question asked time and again is, "Why are there no *young* newcomers
to ham radio?" The answer is quite simple: elitism.<<

From this, Bob delved into a lengthy dissertation on the generation gap.

Neither one of you are correct.

The lack of "youth" in Amateur Radio is a simple matter of lack of
application and a proliferation of other distractions.

We have to "accentuate the positive" and make it more appealing. The
days of being able to simply infect a youngster with our ability to communicate
globally with a crystal set and spark gap have passed.

Kids today need challenges, and those challenges must have some sort of
practical application.

Thre's no "elitism" or "generation gap" to it. It's ALWAYS been that way.
We just seem to want to forget that every so often and we wind up reinventing
the wheel.

So much wasted time when there's no time to waste at all.

73

Steve, K4YZ

140. Re: I feel sorry for TIT's husband.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: z005381b@bc.seflin.org
Message-ID: <8h8e41$ob8@nntp.seflin.org>
Source record: 140

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL (vlfiscus@mcn.net) wrote:
[snip]

: You restructured non-technical sort who don't want to put forth any effort
: to move further in ham radio should go back to CB because as hams you're
: breaking the rules. Part 97 say's hams should continue in the advancement
: of radio theory and knowledge. kim, your brain is vegitating.

Vince,

This message is to let you know that some nut is sending messages to the
r.r.a.p. newsgroup and signing your name to them.
--
Jim Rosenthal, WA4STJ

141. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000602122713.19467.00000836@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 141

In article <20000602043318.18766.00002107@nso-fo.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
>>argument.
>>
>No it doesn't.
>

Yes, it does!

73 de Larry, K3LT

142. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000602122713.19467.00000837@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 142

In article <39379172.362658@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>Now Jim, that is going too far. Anything can remind
>anybody of anything. Please don't say, "No it can't."
>

Cecil:

No, it can't! Seeing an airplane fly over me doesn't remind me of
a rowboat in the middle of the desert!

73 de Larry, K3LT

143. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000602122714.19467.00000838@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 143

In article <3936A25F.DBFBB9BF@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Well, I guess I've never been in Kim's neck o' the woods, and the
>> issue never came up! And another thing I did notice about the Texans
>> I'd met is that they were very decent, modest, and moral people --
>
>Who, unlike you, do not try to force their morality on
>their neighbors. Most people in my neighborhood believe
>it is wrong to consume alcohol but they do not try to
>keep me from consuming alcohol.
>

Cecil:

I thought you lived in a "dry" county where it was actually *illegal* to
drink alcohol! If your neighbors know about your stash of spoiled
grape juice, how did they find out? I would expect a MENSA member
could keep a secret a bit better than that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

144. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <8h8ptvutr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 144
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <8gc52g019i7@enews1.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant) wrote:
> The question asked time and again is, "Why are there no *young*
newcomers to
> ham radio?"

But there ARE young newcomers to ham radio. A few weeks ago, a bunch of local hams had dinner together to plan for FD, and among us was an 11 year old Tech. I'm also well acquainted with a local Extra who is 14, and has several years' experience. And they are just the ones I know well.

> The answer is quite simple: elitism.

The question is flawed.
>
> The elitist mentality fosters itself when a group of people think
that they're
> doing something "better" than someone else. It's not limited to one
individual
> group. It's a disease that infects Christian fundamentalists, as well
as
> teenagers who think they're "alternative". (You know the type. They
walk into a
> CD store, sporting spiked, purple hair and facial piercings, and
complain
> because the store doesn't have the entire discography of some obscure
band from
> San Francisco who call themselves Blood Monster Mushrooms.)

Sure. WHat does that have to do with ham radio?
>
> This elitism makes the group irrational. The dangers of the elitist
mindset are
> very real. First, it more than likely creates hypocrites out of the
people
> involved. Second, it annihilates the appeal of the group's
philosophy, as no
> one likes to be talked down to. Third, it turns the group into
general
> assholes, making them snobby, confrontatinal, and unlikeable.

Maybe.
>
> I've seen this attitude time and again in ham radio. It's seen in

club
> meetings, at hamfests, on the air, and most prevalently on the
internet.

Give us some examples, please.

> My
> idea of ham radio would be a wide range of individuals discussing
many
> different topics, and engaging in a meaningful and intelligent
exchange of
> information.

Sounds good to me. Sounds like many of the CW ragchews I have on 40
meters.

>(That certainly doesn't happen on the typical DX contact) However,
> that's asking for a Utopia that just isn't going to happen.

Why can't it happen?

> Some will even say
> that this is against the fundamental purpose of the service as
outlined in Part
> 97.1.

What rules would it violate? Obviously some things are off limits, but
not all.

> These people can't even see past a rulebook to see that amateur radio
has
> become stagnant.

Not to me!

> But, no. The majority of hams today are old and/or obese, white, males

Let's hold it right there a moment. First off, you're making a broad
generalization without any data being presented.

"old" - well, I'm 46. To a teenager, I'm old. To an octagenarian, I'm
young. How old are YOU? And why does age matter so much? How old does a
person have to be in order to be "old"?

"obese" - Most American adults are overweight, according to various
studies. Obese is defined as being more than a certain percentage
overweight (I can't recall the exact number offhand). Why should a
person's value be tied to their body mass index, as you seem to be
doing?

btw, I go 215 right now, at 6' 3". That's too heavy - I'm working
towards 180.

> who have
> nothing better to do than talk about the "good 'ol days", their

health
> problems, and the weather.

Not the hams I know. All sorts of great stuff on the local repeaters
and the CW bands.
>
> Based on these facts, you can see that the new license structure
isn't going to
> save ham radio.

Except that your "facts" turn out to be false, or irrelevant.

> A lower code test requirement isn't going to save ham radio.

So we should have left it alone? I don't think so! At least 75% of
commenters to the NPRM favored the 5 wpm General license.

> Only a change of attitude will save ham radio.

"Save" it from what?

>Until a redefining of the basis
> and purpose happens,

How's that going to happen?

> and until the poisonous elitism is purged, the appeal of
> the internet for the free and open exchange of ideas will continue to
grow, and
> interest in ham radio will continue to dwindle until it is like the
dead
> languages of Europe: Still there for the curious, but of no common
use.

Sorry, Tom, but the facts speak otherwise.

For one thing, if you look at the history of ham radio (at least in the
USA), you'll see that it has grown rapidly in some eras and slowly or
not at all in others. Rapid growth before and immediately after WW1 -
slow growth in the 1920s - a veritable explosion in the early '30s
(almost triple the number of hams in less than 5 years) - slow growth
through the rest of the '30s, then a decline during WW2.

Fast growth from the ned of WW2 to 1963, then no growth for almost a
decade. Steady growth from the early '70s to the late '80s, then very
slow growth since then.

US license figures: (approximate)
19K hams in 1929
46K hams in 1935
60K hams in 1946
100K hams in 1951
250K hams in 1963
350K hams in 1979

550K hams in 1990
678K hams in 2000

What downward trend?

73 de Jim, N2EY
-
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

145. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: jui@rwi.com
Message-ID: <3937E4EE.AB9CDC4E@rwi.com>
Source record: 145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Obviously a dummy that couldn't learn morse code.
Go buy a study tape and study harder. LOL
Long live morse code and ham radio.

Sycho_Graphics wrote:

> Didn't try and I don't want to better places to spend my time and money.
> Who needs a damn test to operate a CONSUMER oriented electrical
> communication device in the 21st Century? I use a cellphone, GPS receiver,
> cordless phones, computers, TV, VCR (I can actually set it too :)),
> High-end Home Stereo remote, FRS devices, CB radio, Palm Pilot , RC cars and
> boats and even a microwave oven and I don't need a damn license for those.
> What makes HAM gear soooo complicated I need to pass a test and be TAXED on
> it by the FCC?
>
> By the way Jim who the hell are you gonna MORSE with? Aliens, Russian SPY
> ships, the Space Shuttle, clandestine operatives so deep under cover that
> they can't afford voice transmission equipment (poor bastards). So, who the
> HELL do you Morse too in the 21st century??? MORSE is DEAD. dot dot dot
> dash dash dash dot dot blah blah blah HA HA HA :) :) :) You guys kill me.
>
> Man you guys crack me up get with the times folks your HAM hobby is as
> OBSOLETE as my VIC-20 and C-64 are to 1Ghz CPU's. Let the FCC use the space
> for something more useful, at least more interesting. Hell I'd buy a GMRS
> unit once the FCC re-allocates frequencies, manufactures mass produce (a la
> FRS), drop the price and licensing bullshit. I can see a uses for a 5-10
> mile communication device on UHF, FRS is neat but limited. Technology WILL
> not stand still for long, I would love said GMRS with built in GPS, terrain
> mapping database, hell throw a cellphone , scanner, personal organizer and
> MP3 in there too, sell for $300.00 - 500.00 sweet. The future looks good to
> me at least.
>
> "Jim West" <Jim@jameswest.com> wrote in message
> news:kspcjsktuf10186v06tks2d6tjhlf0ikk7@4ax.com...
> > On Wed, 31 May 2000 11:23:28 -0400, "Sycho_Graphics"
> > <Sycho_Graphics@email.msn.com> wrote:
> >
> > >In short, WHO CARES. Let the ignorant, self-centered, egotistical
> basterds
> > >all go away so I don't have to hear about how great HAM was in 1960 one
> more
> > >damn time. I think they are a joke, cops think they are a joke, most
> local
> > >authorities (In real cities not shit towns) think they are a joke, anyone

> > >under the age of 30 thinks they are a joke, they are the only ones who
> seem
> > >to take themselves (way too) seriously. BYE, bye and good riddance.
> >
> > Couldn't pass the morse code test eh?
> >
> > >
> > >
> > >"me" <@.> wrote in message
> > >news:1BC5AB4B06B6F8D8.AAC0E5EAFC5FA110.82C6E091ECEFDFD2@lp.airnews.net...
> > >Funny. In 2 or so years there will be 200 hams.
> > >Those 200 hams will still think there are alot of hams.
> > >1 HAM is one ego and a waste of time too many (CW). :)
> > >
> > >
> >

146. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Walter Gesundheit <w2dne@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <8h8qg7vda1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 146

In article <20000602092243.14161.00001471@ng-cl1.aol.com>,
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson) wrote:

> Perhaps THEN you might understand my penchant
> for SOME standards of grammar and structure.

SteveyBOY, you Dump Huck, this is the amateur radio section of
UseNet.

Take your "penchant" and go rant on alt.old.maid.grammar.teachers.

We want to talk about radios, not argue narrow issues of semantics
with you and Len and Cec and Mark. What a bunch of lamers!

And that's the way it is!

Walter

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

147. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8h8rsngg1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 147

In article <KTeZ4.27$d5.34578@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> <horseshoestew@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > > If you are offering the CSCE form as "proof" that the FCC is seeking
> > to grow
> > > by regulating the Amateur Radio Service, you missed the mark. The
> > CSCE is
> > > used by the VEs and VE teams, not by the FCC.
>
> > The information contained on the CSCE isn't mandated by the FCC?
>
> I believe that it is, but the information in no way that I can see directly
> impacts the amount of work the FCC has to do wrt CSCEs, so the premise of my
> post still stands (IMHO) -- the CSCE is not proof that the FCC is seeking to
> grow by regulating the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> I think the black helicopter may have been a piece of dust in your eye. :-)

I've never been one to go in too much for govt. conspiracy theories; although they do exist - Gulf of Tonkin, Watergate, Contragate...

But, in my experience, government(and the government tax burden) always attempts to grow and rarely shrinks. Generally, less government(especially less centralized government) is better government.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Stewart - N0MHS

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

148. Re: Cable Modems

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: n3jja@spammers.are.wanks
Message-ID: <8h8qr9ehd0@216.155.32.14>
Source record: 148

On Fri, 2 Jun 2000 10:54:04, billsohl@interactive.net (Bill Sohl)
wrote:

> On Thu, 01 Jun 2000 14:34:54 -0700 (PDT), "Phil Kane"
> <nospam@nospam.spam> wrote:
>
> >On 31 May 2000 03:17:25 GMT, T.L. Bryant wrote:
> >
> >>Winblows...err, Windows '98 machine
> >
> > My condolences.....
> >
> >>that I have to use because the cable company refuses to support Linux,
> >
> > Does not the cableco deliver a TCP/IP connection on a RJ-45 out
> > of their bridge and cannot you reach their IP address from
> > your TCP/IP applications such as a browser running under linux??
> >
> > What is there to "support"?
> >
> > Alternatibely, will the linux Win Emulator programs ("wine" or
> > equivalent) not run any Win application that the cableco insist on?
> >
> > I run into this "we don't support your system" quite often
> > because I run IBM's OS/2 Warp as my OS of choice.
> >
> > Lastly, LinkSys makes a series of inexpensive 4-port-LAN
> > routers which effectiovely isolate the TCP/IP internet
> > connection from whatever operating system you are running. I
> > use the model that interfaces with a dial-up modem and our son
> > uses the model that interfaces with a TCP/IP RJ45 connection such
> > as Cable Modem or DSL. Your computer communicates with the
> > router. the router setup is through a browser of your choice,
> > and the router communicates with the outside world. Some of
> > them even include a real firewall. Check out <www.linksys.com>.
> > 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
> Phil is correct. The details are in the interface itself,
> not the fact that you use Windows or not. Does the
> cable modem company say you can't connect using a
> Mac? I'll bet they support that (or claim to anyway).
>
> Your connection to the cable modem is independent
> of the OS you are running.

> Ask the cable company for a spec on the interface
> connection itself.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

The only rub here is if the provider is using PPPoE. It that case, you'll need to find out what the status is of the PPPoE stuff for Linux.

Of course, if you need more than one computer to share the connection (and, in my case support 3 different OSes at home), then I point you to the LinkSys Cable Modem / DSL router. It's wonderful peice of hardware.

149. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <epWVemLz$GA.194@cpmsnbbsa06>
Source record: 149

N2EY wrote
> Heck, the backlog of the past six
>weeks alone will bust 680K.

Isn't the backlog mostly old hams upgrading?
That won't increase the population much...

150. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <O359emLz$GA.194@cpmsnbbsa06>
Source record: 150

N2EY wrote
>- there has to be some sort of
>gateway to Usenet in order to have a working system.

Would you really want Usenet on the ham bands?
Would the FCC even allow it?

151. Re: Callsigns - was Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ONcjfmLz$GA.194@cpmsnbbsa06>
Source record: 151

n2ey@aol.com wrote
but the W6 version is listed as far back as 1979 - and it
>may go back even farther. (1979 was the oldest callbook I had, and I
>just sold it).

It is not listed in the 1973 callbook...

152. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8h8uhs$2h3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 152

In article <20000602043319.18766.00002109@nso-fo.aol.com>,
n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

> >Note that I'm
> >talking competitive in the sense of access speed only. Our
> >data content would be different - I think that it would actually
> >be superior to the untamed Internet, in many ways(no
> >advertising(except ham gear!), no profanity,
> >technically-oriented).
>
> All of which is prohibited by law, of course. But there's the hitch:
What you
> will get is not internet access, nor the web, nor even usenet or plain
old
> email. Right there, a lot of the audience disappears. Worse, though,
is the
> need for hams to build and maintain the backbone network. That's the
"who'll
> bell the cat" problem. With no commercial content, there's no revenue
> generation to fund anything.

In recent years, the American culture(and media) has continally gotten more filthy, pornographic, and violent. I'm betting(hoping) that our culture will begin to get tired of that trend, and begin to reverse it. A non-commercial, G-rated, technically-oriented network may be just what many are looking for. We are uniquely poised to provide this service.

> Fact is, a highspeed national digital network using UHF ham radio has
been
> technically possible for at least 15-18 years. The problem is cost.
How many
> nodes would such a network need, and who is going to build, maintain
and
> coordinate them?

We need to use the existing Internet as the backbone, and then just use data radios at the ISP(gateway) and user sites. The gateways could just be PCs hooked up to a DSP or cable modem connection at people's houses! The gateways would just need to be set up to allow access to "ARS-friendly" IP addresses.

> The answer, I think, is some sort of universal digital protocol and
network
> that can do voice, data, text, image, whatever, so that the same
network can

> handle amateur email, realtime voice and text, newsgroups like this one, and
> lots more. But that's a BIG order. Takes a lot more than a cheap dataradio to
> do that one.

Forget ATM, and all that stuff. Let's stick to a working, proven protocol in TCP/IP, and NOT try to shoot for live video. Live voice nets might be a real cool and very applicable, and very "do-able" application. Everything is in place - except the cheap, TCP/IP-capable hi-speed(56Kbps or better) data radios.

You talked about folks getting by with their old 28.8Kbps links. Well that may be true, for those that are willing to live with text-only non-web and image access. But, even then, they have dedicated channels. Remember, we have to share our channels. We really need to get above 56Kbps to make this thing feasable.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Stewart - N0MHS

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

153. Re: stamp design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <sjg40c1b5ri60@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 153

w1rfi@arrl.net (Ed Hare, W1RFI) wrote in
<XtBZ4.39$d5.48045@news.ntplx.net>:
>
>The results of elections have not, and can not, be ignored. The
>process is open, both candidates are generally here for the opening of
>the ballots and, if you look at the number of unseated Directors over
>the years, I think it pretty obvious that the members get the Director
>they vote for.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I'm not saying that these aren't valid elections, I'm saying that those elected ignored the wishes of the membership. Now why would an elected person what to ignore membership? Because doing what's best for the amateur radio might mean depleting the corprate bank account!

>> >Polling is NOT the best way to get member input, IMHO; issues are
>> >best solved by those who have more vested interest than checking off
>> >a box on a question they may or may not fully understand or may or
>> >may not be very interested in.

Anyone with a license has a vested interest in amateur radio and are the only ones with a vested interest. Without hams, there would be no amateur radio, but your statement above shows that you and the BoD don't believe hams have an interest. I was proud to be an ARRL member, back when you guys cared. The ARRL used to support everything I thought was important. What Changed? not me.
>
>
>None of those whom made the decisions about the ARRL restructuring
>position have any vested financial interst in the outcome...

Now that's BULL. Publish their names.

154. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <hnUZ4.396$Cs.3011@news2.atl>
Source record: 154

I completely disagree with you, Rick. Instead of us lightening up, IMHO, you need to become more responsible (see, opinion can work both ways) Example: It's okay for you to find Kim's callsign non-suggestive, but if "we" voice our opinion, we are thinned skinned and need to enjoy life more. Why do you make such general statements? You don't know us, our lifestyles, or how much we enjoy life. For all you know, I could be throwing one huge party at my house as I write this. (hey, turn that music down, I'm posting to the NG) : -))

Since I can't predict where Kim will be operating, I can't avoid those frequencies like I do with 3950 and 14313. So, I think I'll just stay in the CW portion of the bands and tell my 6 year old grandson that her call is W5X (the weather lady) should she ever ID in CW.

Arnie -
KT4ST

Rick wrote ...

> Oh so what about Kim's call sign, are all of you that thin skinned
> and upset over here call letters? It does not bother me one bit! In
> fact if I heared her on the air I would definitely try to contact her.
> For some one with a call sign like that I know that person would be
> full of life. The rest of you people have to lighten up a little and
> learn to enjoy life.
>
Rick KC2ESD

155. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602155553.24212.00000369@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 155

>Subject: Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...
>From: Walter Gesundheit w2dne@my-deja.com
>Date: 06/02/2000 12:22 PM Central Daylight Time

To the "esteemed" rollcall of others such as Lennie and Mark, add the anonymous cowardice herself.

The nation that is ready to fight in peacetime is less likely to HAVE to fight in wartime......(Author unknown, but he probably wasn't a politician!)

156. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <393819D7.C8D6E96F@uci.edu>
Source record: 156

W6RCecilA wrote:

> N2EY wrote:

> > tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant) writes:
> > >This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
> > >argument.

> > No it doesn't.

> Now Jim, that is going too far. Anything can remind
> anybody of anything. Please don't say, "No it can't."

"He's not going to argue with you until he's been paid."

You mean to tell us that with all the Monty Python references that have appeared here over the years, you still haven't sought out the Monty Python argument clinic sketch? It's a parody of this newsgroup I tell you! :-) The argument clinic is right down the hall from the "being hit on the head lessons". I think there's a parallel in there somewhere.

To N2EY - Is it on "Matching Tie and Handkerchief" ?

73, Jim AC6XG

157. Re: List of the rec.radio newsgroups

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <8h98s7$k43$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 157
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Rick <Rickhit@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
> You forgot one. alt.radio.family (Family Radio Service)

Rick, nothing was forgotten; the alt.radio hierarchy contains at least thirty subgroups, but they're not part of the rec.radio hierarchy. Alt(ernative) NGs can be created on a whim by anyone (and because of that, many ISPs won't carry them), while the rec(reational) NGs are created only after a rather long formal process (Proposal, Call For Discussion, Call For Votes, vote tallying by an independent vote counter, approval by the newsgroup creation committee who then will finally send out a control message asking ISPs worldwide to add the newly approved NG to their news collections). The recreational groups are created only after going through close scrutiny at many levels, including the Usenet readers (who approve or disapprove of the newly proposed group with their votes).

Jeff

158. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <8h993rkib1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 158
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant) wrote:
> The question asked time and again is, "Why are there no *young*
>newcomers to ham radio?"

Can they handle it? There's so much to learn:

In our one-hundred year history, only a small percentage of each generation has shown an interest in the self-learning of electronic theory, soldering, reading and understanding schematics, collecting components, assembling radios, national and international radio laws, ionospheric propagation and antenna theory, assembling antennas, and communicating world-wide by RF emissions. It's very specialized; it was never an Everyman's hobby. That we have 670,000 licensees attempting to abide by our fundamental purpose (Title 47 CFR 97.1) is in itself amazing.

Jeff

159. Re: List of the rec.radio newsgroups

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Brian Hill <jonnysocko@jps.net>
Message-ID: <yrWZ4.955$v_.24779@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 159
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And `rec.antiques.radio+phono`

160. Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: lak <lak@radio.land.com>
Message-ID: <e69usCOz$GA.324@cpmsnbbsa06>
Source record: 160
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I have been going off and on since 1968 when I was in Jr High.

Observations:

The flea Market was only about 80% filled by Friday afternoon.
Sunday at opening time more vendors were leaving the Flea Market than people coming in.
Inside on both days no one knocked me over due to crowded conditions.
Hamvention Offical had to make a Sunday Annoucement at 0900 reminding inside vendor they were contracted to stay until close.
Heard a lot more complaining about every aspect from more people both days.
Especially, the bus situation.

Innocent John!!! <jmackey@NOSPAMparg.org> wrote in message news:QeLY4.75843$55.608261@news1.sttls1.wa.home.com...
> Steve - I'll see your 11 & raise you by 2, this was my 13th year at
> Dayton (every year since 1987). My motel was FULL & ran out of
> roll-a-way beds & had to issue at least one air mattress.
>
> At the awards drawing, the MC announced the attendance was at roughly
> 28,000. Since then the ARRL (Dayton was the ARRL National Convention
> this year) announced the attendance at being slightly over 30,000.
>
> BTW - At Dayton, often times venders start to leave on Saturday afternoon,
> as has happened for many years.
>
>
> "Steve - KF2TI/AE (Landing, NJ)" <kf2ti@interactive.net> wrote in message
> > Not even close to 30k. I've been to Dayton (this is my 11th)when you
> > couldn't even walk inside (on a nice day). The parking lots outside the
> > arena weren't even close to having the number of cars from last year
> > alone. Inside vendors like R&L and HRO said the same thing. My hotel,
> > normally filled had 50 rooms available for walk in check-in.
> >
> > There were more people when the event was held in April. The change to
> > May did wonders for the weather (at least it doesn't SNOW anymore), but
> > there are so many time conflicts for everyone in May.
> >
> > If 30k people were there, then how does one explain why so many outside
> > vendors left Saturday? I'd say there were probably more than the
> > unofficial estimate but way under 30k. The best people to talk to was
> > the food vendors. According to 3 of them, they had WAYYYY too much food
> > for the number of people, even factoring in the fact that the pricing
was

> > outrageous.
>
>
>
>

161. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000602194648.19467.00000952@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 161

In article <hnUZ4.396$Cs.3011@news2.atl>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>
>Since I can't predict where Kim will be operating, I can't avoid those
>frequencies like I do with 3950 and 14313. So, I think I'll just stay in
>the CW portion of the bands and tell my 6 year old grandson that her call is
>W5X (the weather lady) should she ever ID in CW.
>
>

Arnie:

You'll also have to tell your grandson that Kim's fist really sucks,
but don't use that particular word!

73 de Larry, K3LT

162. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: jui@rwi.com
Message-ID: <393850FF.B3D8D91E@rwi.com>
Source record: 162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

That didn't even make sense brainfart.

Bud the Real wrote:

> jui@rwi.com hollered from the outhouse...
>
> >Obviously a dummy that couldn't learn morse code.
>
> While you're just a dummy who couldn't buy a brain?
>
> To reply by email, remove the XYZ.
>
> Lumber Cartel (tinlc) #2063. Spam this account at your own risk.

163. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <rDYZ4.1267$j6.6693@news4.atl>
Source record: 163

Better to let him think that the callsign is W5X than explaining the alternative, eh?

Larry wrote ...
>
> You'll also have to tell your grandson that Kim's fist really sucks,
> but don't use that particular word!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

164. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: technocrat <jbohanejrNOjbSPAM@juno.com.invalid>
Message-ID: <16be26ff.c6e668e0@usw-ex0103-018.remarq.com>
Source record: 164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Hey Sycho...

When all of the support infrastructure that makes your
electronic goodies fail, will you be able to communicate with
anyone about anything?

We will!!

I can make a small spark-gap transmitter (better yet, three or
four spark gap transmitters) from a busted up transistor radio.
If I happen to have a few hundred feet of wire, I can generate
electricity with my bare feet.

Can you? Can you tear apart an apparently dead battery of cells
to determine which cell(s) is bad, remove it, and get useable
current from the rest?

Can you generate a distress signal using only your wits and and
a pile of electronic "junk"?

You don't understand the art of amateur radio.

See you on the island! Going rate: Two quarts of water (de-
salinated only) for 2 minutes on the transmitter.

JB

* Sent from RemarQ http://www.remarq.com The Internet's Discussion Network *
The fastest and easiest way to search and participate in Usenet - Free!

165. Re: Cable Modems

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <39386E9A.F677FB2A@arrl.org>
Source record: 165

Jim Nuytens wrote:
>
> The only rub here is if the provider is using PPPoE. It that case,
> you'll need to find out what the status is of the PPPoE stuff for
> Linux.

Fully suported. Easier, in fact, than the Windows PPPoE stuff I've seen.

> Of course, if you need more than one computer to share the connection
> (and, in my case support 3 different OSes at home), then I point you
> to the LinkSys Cable Modem / DSL router. It's wonderful peice of
> hardware.

I just leave my Linux box running -- no extra equipment needed.

Jon, KE3Z
--
Jon Bloom, KE3Z
jbloom@arrl.org
Electronic Publications Manager (Software, CD-ROMs and Web site)

166. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <39387F07.1E19B94B@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 166

Aaron Jones wrote:

> N2EY wrote
> > Heck, the backlog of the past six
> >weeks alone will bust 680K.
>
> Isn't the backlog mostly old hams upgrading?
> That won't increase the population much...

It will increase the likelihood that they renew their licenses, and that will be an increase. Now if we can convince them that gout and gall bladder surgery QSOs are not a recruiting tool...

167. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <39388063.840B200B@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 167

jui@rwi.com wrote:

> Obviously a dummy that couldn't learn morse code.

Obviously authored by a dummy who could.

***Removed SPAM from the space and scanner groups.

168. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <393881D1.40FA7208@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 168

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:

> It is very bad manners to show disrespect for the heros of the
> past...but unfortunately when the accurate facts get reported, people
> now tend to get skeptical about everything...even our President's
> fidelity....which IMHO shows that people have no respect. Yes... People
> with bad manners show no respect and people who show no respect have
> bad manners.
>
> 73,
> Bob Wex w2ilp (I Like Patriots)
> Did you ever doubt?

Bob, bull. Our president doesn't respect himself, his family, his office,
or the people of America. The rest of us are simply waiting for a change -
any change.
73,
Brian

169. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <3938836C.11A12668@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 169

N2EY wrote:

>
> >This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
> >argument.
> >
> No it doesn't.

Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)

170. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <3938830F.72E98D73@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 170

W6RCecilA wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant) writes:
> > >This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
> > >argument.
> > >
> > No it doesn't.
>
> Now Jim, that is going too far. Anything can remind
> anybody of anything. Please don't say, "No it can't."
> --
> 73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

Cecil, just the other day a plane flew over head and it reminded me of a row boat in the desert. 73, Brian

171. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <393885B8.1405990C@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 171

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <2jBZ4.37$d5.46951@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
> <w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Sorry, Vince; it may offer you some comfort to think that, but I post only
> >what I believe. If I didn't believe what I said, I could just as easily
> >not post, and it would not affect my professional standing at ARRL one whit;
> >I am not paid to post on rrap, I am paid to run the Lab, to work on RFI and
> >to coordinate the Lab's technical input to ARRL publications, our
> >spectrum-protection efforts and the like.
> >
>
> Ed:
>
> OK, let's leave you out of this for a bit. If you know one person who
> works at ARRL HQ, who is a licensed amateur, and is in complete
> disagreement with the concept of restructuring, who is it? If you can't
> or won't answer for privacy reasons, ask that person if he/she would
> kindly post to this newsgroup voluntarily. I'll bet you a lobster dinner...

Geez Larry, you live in a crappy apartment in a crappy neighborhood and you spend all of your time betting lobster dinners. Have you ever considered improving your situation? Upgrading your LIFE? Hey - now that's a real incentive!

172. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <39388605.A04C1B21@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 172

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Senator Ted Kennedy has killed more people with his automobile
> than I have with my guns.

Even MD finally gave up on that bumper sticker slogan.

173. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-02 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <393887C1.A7103061@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 173

T.L. Bryant wrote:

> Like you, I used to berate people who made spelling errors, especially WA8ULX,
> who types as if he is wearing boxing gloves.

If that's all it was... Unfortunately, it was his -ideas- that were the easy target.

174. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602203213.06864.00002134@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 174

In article <20000602122713.19467.00000836@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20000602043318.18766.00002107@nso-fo.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
>>>argument.
>>>
>>No it doesn't.
>>
>
>Yes, it does!

It doesn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

175. Re: Callsigns - was Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602203216.06864.00002135@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 175

In article <ONcjfmLz$GA.194@cpmsnbbsa06>, "Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com>
writes:

>n2ey@aol.com wrote
>but the W6 version is listed as far back as 1979 - and it
>>may go back even farther. (1979 was the oldest callbook I had, and I
>>just sold it).
>
>It is not listed in the 1973 callbook...
>
Thanks for the info, Jones!

That means that sometime between 1972 and 1978 (the old Callbooks were printed very early in the year) the FCC issued that call. And the holder has kept it through address changes and for over 21 years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

176. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602211053.11244.00002013@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 176

In article <393819D7.C8D6E96F@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>W6RCecilA wrote:
>
>> N2EY wrote:
>
>> > tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant) writes:
>> > >This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have
>an
>> > >argument.
>
>> > No it doesn't.
>
>> Now Jim, that is going too far. Anything can remind
>> anybody of anything. Please don't say, "No it can't."
>
>"He's not going to argue with you until he's been paid."
>
>You mean to tell us that with all the Monty Python references that have
>appeared here over the years, you still haven't sought out the Monty
>Python argument clinic sketch?

No he hasn't.

> It's a parody of this newsgroup I tell
>you! :-)

No it isn't. The newsgroup is a parody of the sketch. Not a particularly good one, either.

>The argument clinic is right down the hall from the "being hit
>on the head lessons".

No it isn't. It's right UP the hall.

> I think there's a parallel in there somewhere.

You decide. The sketch is available at

http://www.montypython.net

It's available in both script and .wav format. I'd post it here, but I'm not sure about copyright rules concerning such things. Best bet is to hear the .wav format, because the expressions and tempo come through better. "Hit On The Head Lessons" is actually another sketch that immediately follows "Argument Clinic".

It originally appeared on the TV show, about 1970, then in the movie "And Now For Something Completely Different".

>
>To N2EY - Is it on "Matching Tie and Handkerchief" ?

That's the record album that contains a single disc that has three sides.
(That's not a joke - it really does have three sides on a single disc). I'm not
sure if it's the one, but the .wav format has the sketch anyway.

Gotta go. Porgy Tirebiter just showed up.

73 de Jim, N2EY

177. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000602211054.11244.00002014@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 177

In article <39379172.362658@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant) writes:
>> >This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
>> >argument.
>> >
>> No it doesn't.
>
>Now Jim, that is going too far.

No it isn't.

>Anything can remind
>anybody of anything.

Sure it can.

>Please don't say, "No it can't."

I'm not allowed to argue with you unless you've paid.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>--

178. Re: stamp design

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <39386D7A.5017@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 178

Ed Hare, W1RFI wrote:
>
>
> Who could better set ARRL policy on that matter, those that have taken it
> upon themselves to be fully informed, or those who have not read the info as
> published? Would this matter really be best resolved by a poll of members,
> of resolved by HQ staff who have devoted hundreds of hours to studying the
> issue and working with the manufacturers, the FCC and the ARRL Board?
>

The scene you describe above seems similar to what one sees on C-SPAN when some Senate or House committee is shown in session. The congressmen, like poor actors, try to impress the TV audience that they are fully knowledgable of the issue at hand, while their minions scurry back and forth behind them shoving notes under their noses and whispering into their ears, manipulating, coaching, and directing the whole proceedings.

"Shhhh, Senator, read question no. 2, then skip to 10, then yield equal time to Senator Fogbound. He will read comment 6 into the record". So, just like the Senate chambers, the HQ staff manipulate the BoD's, replacing the informed membership and their rightful influence, because "they" have assumed the role of the better informed.

Is this what you meant? Otherwise, one might question just what you do mean by "...resolved by HQ Staff...working with the manufacturers, the FCC, and the ARRL Board?"?

IMHO, the HQ staff should be relegated to the executive activities, not the policy making activities. That should be reserved for the national membership and the BoD. The title of the organization is the *American* Radio Relay League, not the *Newington* Radio Relay League.

73,
Clay N4AOX

179. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000603003840.15975.00006492@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 179

In article <20000602203213.06864.00002134@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>>>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
>
>>>>argument.
>>>>
>>>No it doesn't.
>>>
>>
>>Yes, it does!
>
>It doesn't.
>

It most assuredly does!

180. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000603005232.15975.00006493@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 180

In article <393885B8.1405990C@pop3.freewwweb.com>, p57
<p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:

>
>Geez Larry, you live in a crappy apartment in a crappy neighborhood and you
>spend
>all of your time betting lobster dinners. Have you ever considered improving
>your situation? Upgrading your LIFE? Hey - now that's a real incentive!

Huh? I live in what is probably one of the highest-rent apartment complexes
in the City of Dover, the neighborhood is very nice, and my "situation"
is just fine, thank you very much! About the only way I could improve
my "situation" would be to buy a house around here, but the real estate
market is a buyer's paradise and a seller's hell, and I just don't know for
sure how long I'll be living here. I am anticipating a radical career move
which could very well take me away from Delaware, if not out of the
country, in a year or so -- so I have no need to go thru the hassle of
buying a house, moving into it, and selling it for a loss! New homes
here are overpriced and under-value for money spent, mainly because
Delaware is being paved over at a record pace by a high-volume,
cookie-cutter cheeze-box developer. Fly over northern New Castle
County and all you'll see is vinyl siding as far as the eye can see!
Nope -- my present situation suits me just fine, thank you very much --
and I enjoy the challenge of operating QRP/CW from my apartment!
And it's unlikely that the house I eventually purchase, if I ever purchase
another one, won't be chosen for it's suitability to ham radio operation!
That used to always be a priority for me, but it isn't anymore! Now I'm
more concerned with potential for increased resale value. I'll leave
the unsightly towers and beams to the terminal microphone morons!

73 de Larry, K3LT

181. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000603005232.15975.00006494@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 181

In article <39388605.A04C1B21@pop3.freewwweb.com>, p57
<p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> Senator Ted Kennedy has killed more people with his automobile
>> than I have with my guns.
>
>Even MD finally gave up on that bumper sticker slogan.

What can I say? It's a classic!

73 de Larry, K3LT

*** I'll keep my laws off of your body if you keep your laws off my GUNS!

182. Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Innocent John!!! <jmackey@NOSPAMparg.org>
Message-ID: <3T0_4.85627$55.699389@news1.sttls1.wa.home.com>
Source record: 182
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"lak" <lak@radio.land.com> wrote in message
> Sunday at opening time more vendors were leaving the Flea Market than
people
> coming in.

That's normal, a lot of venders start to vacate on sunday morning or
saturday evening
because they have sold out or made so much money that they can afford to
leave early.

> Inside on both days no one knocked me over due to crowded conditions.

That only happens on years it rains.

> Hamvention Offical had to make a Sunday Annoucement at 0900 reminding
inside
> vendor they were contracted to stay until close.
> Heard a lot more complaining about every aspect from more people both
days.
> Especially, the bus situation.

Those two things happen every year.

183. call signs???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Appassionata von Klimax <Pas_von_Kli@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <DQ0_4.685$EU3.3379@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 183

I am taking my Extra on Saturday and want to have AA5VK to go with my name.
How do I apply for it?

Apassionata von Klimax

184. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603043324.18766.00002239@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 184

In article <8h8uhs$2h3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, horseshoestew@my-deja.com writes:

>> >Note that I'm
>> >talking competitive in the sense of access speed only. Our
>> >data content would be different - I think that it would actually
>> >be superior to the untamed Internet, in many ways(no
>> >advertising(except ham gear!), no profanity,
>> >technically-oriented).
>>
>> All of which is prohibited by law, of course. But there's the hitch:
>What you
>> will get is not internet access, nor the web, nor even usenet or plain
>old
>> email. Right there, a lot of the audience disappears. Worse, though,
>is the
>> need for hams to build and maintain the backbone network. That's the
>"who'll
>> bell the cat" problem. With no commercial content, there's no revenue
>> generation to fund anything.
>
>In recent years, the American culture(and media) has continally gotten
>more filthy, pornographic, and violent.

So what's the downside? ;-)

Seriously, though, I agree in part. Media standards have certainly deteriorated in the past several decades. We went from too restricted (Dick Van Dyke and Mary Tyler Moore in single beds) to...well, you know what the modern media is like.

> I'm betting(hoping) that our
>culture will begin to get tired of that trend, and begin to reverse it.

I hope so too. Finally, something we agree on!

> A non-commercial, G-rated, technically-oriented network may be just
>what many are looking for. We are uniquely poised to provide this
>service.

That's definitely a selling point of the ARS. But there are some hams who are against the G rating. (See the discussion about certain callsigns)
>
>> Fact is, a highspeed national digital network using UHF ham radio has
>been
>> technically possible for at least 15-18 years. The problem is cost.
>How many

>> nodes would such a network need, and who is going to build, maintain
>and
>> coordinate them?
>
>We need to use the existing Internet as the backbone, and then just use
>data radios at the ISP(gateway) and user sites.

Then what you have is amateur radio as an ISP and content filter system.

>The gateways could just
>be PCs hooked up to a DSP or cable modem connection at people's houses!
> The gateways would just need to be set up to allow access to
>"ARS-friendly" IP addresses.

The content would still need to be filtered, though. And somebody has to build
maintain and fund the gateways. To serve a reasonable area, a LOT of gateways
would be needed.
>
>> The answer, I think, is some sort of universal digital protocol and
>network
>> that can do voice, data, text, image, whatever, so that the same
>network can
>> handle amateur email, realtime voice and text, newsgroups like this
>one, and
>> lots more. But that's a BIG order. Takes a lot more than a cheap
>dataradio to
>> do that one.
>
>Forget ATM, and all that stuff. Let's stick to a working, proven
>protocol in TCP/IP, and NOT try to shoot for live video.

Whoops! Didin't mean to imply live video.

>Live voice
>nets might be a real cool and very applicable, and very "do-able"
>application.

That's why I think they are worth going away from TCP/IP.

> Everything is in place - except the cheap, TCP/IP-capable
>hi-speed(56Kbps or better) data radios.
>
AND the gateways. Don't forget them!

>You talked about folks getting by with their old 28.8Kbps links. Well
>that may be true, for those that are willing to live with
>text-only non-web and image access.

Not relly. Lots of folks with 56 k modems connect much slower.

> But, even then, they have dedicated
>channels. Remember, we have to share our channels.

OK, then what we need is 28.8 or better speed while sharing.

The big issue, though, is the rest of the setup (gateways, etc.) and how the filters will work.
>
> We really need to
>get above 56Kbps to make this thing feasable.

And to be a big enough leap beyond 9600.

But the big question - who will DO all olf this - remains to be answered.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>
>

185. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603043325.18766.00002240@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 185

In article <O359emLz$GA.194@cpmsnbbsa06>, "Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote
>>- there has to be some sort of
>>gateway to Usenet in order to have a working system.
>
>Would you really want Usenet on the ham bands?

(expletive deleted) NO!!

>Would the FCC even allow it?

I don't think so.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

186. Re: Real angle of FCC/ARRL regarding restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603043325.18766.00002241@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 186

In article <epWVemLz$GA.194@cpmsnbbsa06>, "Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote
>> Heck, the backlog of the past six
>>weeks alone will bust 680K.
>
>Isn't the backlog mostly old hams upgrading?.

Yep, that's true

>That won't increase the population much...

But it will delay the processing of new licenses, since they all go through the
VE system. The delay for a brand-new ham is probably much greater now than
before April 15.

73 de Jim, N2EY

187. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8ha60j02bmj@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 187
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

In article <16be26ff.c6e668e0@usw-ex0103-018.remarq.com>,
jbohanejrNOjbSPAM@juno.com.invalid says...
>
>Hey Sycho...
>
>When all of the support infrastructure that makes your
>electronic goodies fail, will you be able to communicate with
>anyone about anything?
>
>We will!!

So will CBers. Besides, the people who have the money invested in the
communications infrastructure won't let things stay down for any extended
period of time.

>
>I can make a small spark-gap transmitter (better yet, three or
>four spark gap transmitters) from a busted up transistor radio.
>If I happen to have a few hundred feet of wire, I can generate
>electricity with my bare feet.

To bad that spark gap is illegal.

Tom - N8ECW

188. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8ha64i12bmj@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 188

In article <20000602122713.19467.00000837@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <39379172.362658@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>
>>
>>Now Jim, that is going too far. Anything can remind
>>anybody of anything. Please don't say, "No it can't."
>>
>
>Cecil:
>
>No, it can't! Seeing an airplane fly over me doesn't remind me of
>a rowboat in the middle of the desert!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You've obviously never heard of Harry Lorraine, Kevin Trudeau, or Tony Buzan.

Tom - N8ECW

189. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603071641.18425.00001961@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 189

In article <3938836C.11A12668@pop3.freewwweb.com>, p57
<p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>
>> >This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
>> >argument.
>> >
>> No it doesn't.
>
>Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)
>
No. Because no such skit exists.

You may be thinking of the scene in "Monty Python And The Holy Grail" in which Lancelot is lured to the Castle Anthrax because Zoot (one of the beautiful inhabitants) left the castle's grail-shaped beacon turned on. The punishment for doing so is a spanking.

The entire scripts of all of the movies, skits and songs are at the various sites, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY (pronounced "Ni!")

190. Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: lak <lak@radio.land.com>
Message-ID: <Oqy6kIVz$GA.328@cpmsnbbsa09>
Source record: 190
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well excccccuse me for being soooo dumb!

Just after several decades of observations and having been a flea market vendor, this year it seemed to be large percentage than usual. I also noted several large flea market vendor whom I have dealt with over the years did not attend for the first time in 10 years.

But I forgot this is the internet where personal opinions must tempered by considering everyone's point of view and framed up to politically corrected to accommodate everyone else on the net.

Next year I will collect evidence in the form of tallies, statements from vendor / patrons, etc. to present a more concise and formal report. I will form a fact finding committee to explore this situation, and issue position paper to congress after 2001 Hamvention, after all a national Icon might be in jeopardy! Application for the committe will soon be on-line at www.who_could_careless.org/applicationsforcommittee/hamvention/form.html

Innocent John!!! <jmackey@NOSPAMparg.org> wrote in message news:3T0_4.85627$55.699389@news1.sttls1.wa.home.com...
>
> "lak" <lak@radio.land.com> wrote in message
> > Sunday at opening time more vendors were leaving the Flea Market than
> people
> > coming in.
>
> That's normal, a lot of venders start to vacate on sunday morning or
> saturday evening
> because they have sold out or made so much money that they can afford to
> leave early.
>
>
> > Inside on both days no one knocked me over due to crowded conditions.
>
> That only happens on years it rains.
>
>
> > Hamvention Offical had to make a Sunday Annoucement at 0900 reminding
> inside
> > vendor they were contracted to stay until close.
> > Heard a lot more complaining about every aspect from more people both
> days.
> > Especially, the bus situation.
>

> Those two things happen every year.
>
>

191. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <3938F43C.CD9A8164@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 191

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <393885B8.1405990C@pop3.freewwweb.com>, p57
> <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Geez Larry, you live in a crappy apartment in a crappy neighborhood and you
> >spend
> >all of your time betting lobster dinners. Have you ever considered improving
> >your situation? Upgrading your LIFE? Hey - now that's a real incentive!
>
> Huh? I live in what is probably one of the highest-rent apartment complexes
> in the City of Dover, the neighborhood is very nice, and my "situation"
> is just fine, thank you very much!

Yet you complain that the gym is populated with "OZ" types and on and on and on.
Which is it?

> About the only way I could improve
> my "situation" would be to buy a house around here, but the real estate
> market is a buyer's paradise and a seller's hell, and I just don't know for
> sure how long I'll be living here. I am anticipating a radical career move
> which could very well take me away from Delaware, if not out of the
> country,

Oh boy, another ex-patriot "Real DXer" offering advice from afar. Maybe some
Hawaii ham will rent you space in his PO Box. Let us know how the restructuring
affects your ability to get a no-exam callsign in whatever foreign country you
decide to move to.

192. Re: call signs???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <3938F3D7.FACBA5FB@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 192

Appassionata von Klimax wrote:

> I am taking my Extra on Saturday and want to have AA5VK to go with my name.
> How do I apply for it?
>
> Apassionata von Klimax

How would we know? Go ask on the rec.radio.amateur.vanitycall newsgroup. Jeff can direct you.

193. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: "David J. Windisch" <davidw@copper.net>
Message-ID: <TP6_4.798$EU3.4554@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 193
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jeff: pls provide the cite.
K3BHJ
****
"Jeffrey Herman" <jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu> wrote in message
news:8h4d1h$2cl$1@news.hawaii.edu...
> Steve - KF2TI/AE (Landing, NJ) <kf2ti@interactive.net> wrote:
> >And they just reported that WWII aged veterans were dying at a rate of
> >1000 per week and the national cemeteries are filling up.
>
> Steve, that figure is 1000 per DAY!!
>
> Jeff

194. Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603094527.08102.00001262@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 194

>Subject: Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)
>From: "lak" lak@radio.land.com
>Date: 06/02/2000 5:21 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id:

>The flea Market was only about 80% filled by Friday afternoon<

I was there at noon Friday and the palce was full of sellers as far as the eye could see. Just how much can you do in one afternoon there anyway?

Most of the flea marketers are people with "real jobs", and taking the extra time to go to Dayton means time off from work.

>Sunday at opening time more vendors were leaving the Flea Market than people coming in.<

Did you have to drive through the construction work thatwas in all directions into and out of Dayton? I'd leave early too if I had to drive a truckload of stuff through all of that AND contend with traffic AND construction detours AND had "hours" to drive to get home....

>Inside on both days no one knocked me over due to crowded conditions<

Gee...the HamVention folks should be chastized and forced to re-route all foot traffic into very narrow, hard to navigate lanes. Shame on them for trying to make it more convienient and enjoyable to cruise the aisles.

>Heard a lot more complaining about every aspect from more people both days.<

I was there two of the three days. All I heard was how hard it was to try and see everything in ONLY three days.

>Especially, the bus situation.<

We parked at the Salem Mall both days and never waited more than 10-15 minutes for a shuttle bus.

Don't know which "Dayton" you went to, but it doesn't sound like The One in Dayton, Ohio.

73

Steve, K4YZ

195. Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603095555.08102.00001264@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 195

>Subject: Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)
>From: "lak" lak@radio.land.com
>Date: 06/03/2000 6:53 AM Central Daylight Time

>Well excccccuse me for being soooo dumb!<

If you are not ready to take the heat for any opinions, comments or statements you make here, I'd recommend you don't COME here.

It's dog-eat-dog here. Trust me.

>Just after several decades of observations and having been a flea market vendor, this year it seemed to be large percentage than usual.<

As you can see, opinions vary.

>I also noted several large flea market vendor whom I have dealt with over the years did not attend for the first time in 10 years.<

There were also new vendors there.....So what?

>But I forgot this is the internet where personal opinions must tempered by considering everyone's point of view and framed up to politically corrected to accommodate everyone else on the net.<

"Politically correct"...?!?! You made observations and commented on them. Responses were made to that that simply said that some of the things you commented on are routine circumstances.

What's not "PC" about that...?!?!

>Next year I will collect evidence in the form of tallies, statements from vendor / patrons, etc. to present a more concise and formal report.<

We'll be waiting with abated breath.

>Application for the committe will soon be on-line at
>www.who_could_careless.org/applicationsforcommittee/hamvention/form.html<

And you'd be right...WHO COULD CARE LESS...?!?!? Answer: ME!

I had a blast, but then I was there to have a good time...not critique the HamVention Committee.

I succeeded, therefore THEY succeeded.

By the way...How many hamfests of this proportion have YOU organized...?!?!?

73

Steve, K4YZ

196. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603095003.15680.00002063@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 196

In article <hnUZ4.396$Cs.3011@news2.atl>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> writes:

>I completely disagree with you, Rick. Instead of us lightening up, IMHO,
>you need to become more responsible (see, opinion can work both ways)
>Example: It's okay for you to find Kim's callsign non-suggestive, but if
>"we" voice our opinion, we are thinned skinned and need to enjoy life more.

I agree with Arnie 100%. Here's what Rick previously posted:

>> Oh so what about Kim's call sign, are all of you that thin skinned
>> and upset over here call letters? It does not bother me one bit!

What Rick is really saying is that if it doesn't bother him, it shouldn't
bother anybody.

>> In
>> fact if I heared her on the air I would definitely try to contact her.
>> For some one with a call sign like that I know that person would be
>> full of life.

That's actually an expression of prejudice, in the sense that Rick is
pre-judging the callsign holder without any real information.

>> The rest of you people have to lighten up a little and
>> learn to enjoy life.
>>
Another expression of prejudice, because he assumes we don't, just because we
have a different opinion.

>Why do you make such general statements? You don't know us, our lifestyles,
>or how much we enjoy life.

Exactly.

> For all you know, I could be throwing one huge
>party at my house as I write this. (hey, turn that music down, I'm posting
>to the NG) : -))

You folks have no idea how idea how difficult it is for me to post here while
getting a full-body hot-oil rub from my supermodel wife and her identical twin
sister (a little bit lower, dear....oooohhh that's the spot). Nor the expense
I've gone to for the special waterproof keyboard and monitor by the hot tub.
>
>Since I can't predict where Kim will be operating, I can't avoid those
>frequencies like I do with 3950 and 14313.

This is one of the reasons ham radio needs different standards than
broadcsting. TV and radio shows are rated by content and shown on a posted

schedule. Objectionable stuff can be avoided by reading the schedule. Since amateur operation is unscheduled, we must assume that anyone can listen/watch anyhting at any time.

> So, I think I'll just stay in
>the CW portion of the bands and tell my 6 year old grandson that her call is
>W5X (the weather lady) should she ever ID in CW.

Another advantage of the mode!

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Arnie -
>KT4ST
>
>
>Rick wrote ...
>
>> Oh so what about Kim's call sign, are all of you that thin skinned
>> and upset over here call letters? It does not bother me one bit! In
>> fact if I heared her on the air I would definitely try to contact her.
>> For some one with a call sign like that I know that person would be
>> full of life. The rest of you people have to lighten up a little and
>> learn to enjoy life.
>>
>Rick KC2ESD
>

197. Re: call signs???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000603095925.05836.00007032@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 197

In article <DQ0_4.685$EU3.3379@newsfeed.slurp.net>, "Appassionata von Klimax"
<Pas_von_Kli@hotmail.com> writes:

>
>I am taking my Extra on Saturday and want to have AA5VK to go with my name.
>How do I apply for it?
>

The VE team, if they have any kind of clue whatsoever, should have
the Vanity Callsign paperwork available; or you can go to www.fcc.gov
and follow the links to the ULS, and apply there. AA5VK is currently
not issued, however it may not be immediately available if someone
else dropped it for a Vanity call and two years had not passed yet.

73 de Larry, K3LT

198. Re: "Dirty Words"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39391352.CAFD2E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 198

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I thought you lived in a "dry" county where it was actually *illegal* to
> drink alcohol!

It's illegal to *sell* alcohol in a dry county, Larry.
It is not illegal to consume it on private property
unless the owner of the property objects.

> If your neighbors know about your stash of spoiled
> grape juice, how did they find out? I would expect a MENSA member
> could keep a secret a bit better than that!

I drink beer while I'm mowing my lawn. I live my life
in the open, suffer the consequences, and therefore
don't have to worry about keeping secrets or needing
to post anonymously.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

199. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39391459.BA48BDFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 199

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Seeing an airplane fly over me doesn't remind me of
> a rowboat in the middle of the desert!

But the next time I see an airplane fly over me, I
will remember your posting, and it *will* remind me
of a rowboat in the middle of the desert.

The point is: You and Jim have absolutely no idea
about or control over what something reminds *ME* of.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

200. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3939159B.3064AD99@IEEE.org>
Source record: 200

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <20000602122713.19467.00000836@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >In article <20000602043318.18766.00002107@nso-fo.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
> >>>argument.
> >>>
> >>No it doesn't.
> >>
> >
> >Yes, it does!
>
> It doesn't.

But you agreed in another posting that anything could remind
anyone of anything. How do you explain the contradiction?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
A fool finds purpose where there is only process.

201. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <393915E4.4BFF09FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 201

```
p57 wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > >This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have an
> > >argument.
> > >
> > No it doesn't.
>
> Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)

It does now.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

202. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39391748.BD0487AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 202

Arnie Macy wrote:
> Since I can't predict where Kim will be operating, I can't avoid those
> frequencies like I do with 3950 and 14313. So, I think I'll just stay in
> the CW portion of the bands and tell my 6 year old grandson that her call is
> W5X (the weather lady) should she ever ID in CW.

Speaking of which, do you also object to the callsign W5XXX?
That's a triple-X rated callsign if I ever say one.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

203. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3939169D.96D46135@IEEE.org>
Source record: 203

N2EY wrote:
>
> <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:
> >Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)
> >
> No. Because no such skit exists.

Ahhhh, but the idea that such a skit exists
certainly does exist and now it does remind
me of it.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

204. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603104441.10388.00001804@nso-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 204

In article <20000603003840.15975.00006492@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20000602203213.06864.00002134@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>>>>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have
>an
>>
>>>>>argument.
>>>>>
>>>>No it doesn't.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Yes, it does!
>>
>>It doesn't.
>>
>
>It most assuredly does!
>
Is this the 5 minute argument, or the full half hour?

73 de Jim, N2EY

205. Re: CC&Rs - visited once again...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39391B16.D6659817@IEEE.org>
Source record: 205

Steve Robeson wrote:
> Instead, Cecil went on the Internet version of a Texas Two-step around
> answering my inquiry as to his source of "facts".

Nope I didn't, Steve. I just couldn't believe anyone could
be so stupid as to deny or ignore the existance of thousands
of all-white KKK gangs. I know of no other organization that
has thousands of chapters of gangs as does the all-white KKK.
Add in the motorcycle gangs, the skin-head gangs, the
Arian Nations gangs, and the militant militia gangs and
I wouldn't be surprised if those outnumber the black gangs.

> Cecil would have us beleive that HIS opinions ARE fact.

That's a bold-faced lie, Steve, and you know it. I have gone
out of my way, more than once, to declare that all my postings
are only my opinions unless stated otherwise and that a lot of
my postings are tongue-in-cheek. What is it about those statements
that you don't understand?

You were a nice guy for awhile, Steve. Then you reverted to
being an AHole. What happened?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
A fool discovers purpose where there is only process.

206. ARRL finds honest work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <rY8_4.868$EU3.5630@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 206

This week's Communications World from VOA includes a segment on ARRL taking up the task of field-strength measurement of broadcast TV to determine who is eligible for distant-signal TV reception on satellite services.

It was not entirely clear just how far this idea has gone but one FCC official is quoted as saying that ARRL is the ideal candidate because of total lack of commercial interest.

http://www.wrn.org hit Listen Now and Communications World.

Dick McCollum N0BK

207. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: z005381b@bc.seflin.org
Message-ID: <8hb67k$fpp@nntp.seflin.org>
Source record: 207

Larry Roll K3LT (yodoc@aol.comnospam) wrote:
: In article <hnUZ4.396$Cs.3011@news2.atl>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4st@csam.net> writes:

: >Since I can't predict where Kim will be operating, I can't avoid those
: >frequencies like I do with 3950 and 14313. So, I think I'll just stay in
: >the CW portion of the bands and tell my 6 year old grandson that her call is
: >W5X (the weather lady) should she ever ID in CW.

: You'll also have to tell your grandson that Kim's fist really sucks,
: but don't use that particular word!
: 73 de Larry, K3LT

You must know some strange ladies! ==80
--
Jim Rosenthal, WA4STJ

208. Re: call signs???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603110802.23178.00001897@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 208

In article <DQ0_4.685$EU3.3379@newsfeed.slurp.net>, "Appassionata von Klimax"
<Pas_von_Kli@hotmail.com> writes:

>I am taking my Extra on Saturday and want to have AA5VK to go with my name.
>How do I apply for it?
>
>Apassionata von Klimax
>
Form 695, downloadable from

http://www.fcc.gov

And yes, I get the joke. More Kickapoo Joy Juice, anyone?

73 de Jim "love those Shmoos" N2EY

209. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603110803.23178.00001898@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 209

In article <39391459.BA48BDFB@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA

(aka Brave Sir Robin)

<Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT

(aka "The Black Knight")

wrote:
>> Seeing an airplane fly over me doesn't remind me of
>> a rowboat in the middle of the desert!
>
>But the next time I see an airplane fly over me, I
>will remember your posting, and it *will* remind me
>of a rowboat in the middle of the desert.
>
>The point is: You and Jim

(aka "Dennis")

>have absolutely no idea
>about or control over what something reminds *ME* of.
>--
Sure we do.

Larry mentioned a connection between seeing an airplane fly overhead and a rowboat in the desert. You read that post. Now, when an airplane flies over YOU, you've said it will remind you of a rowboat in the desert. Which would not have happened if Larry hadn't posted what he did.

So Larry has exerted some influence over what something will remind you of. Not total control, of course, but but some control.

There! I've run rings around you logically!

73 de Jim "pining for the fjords" N2EY

210. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603110803.23178.00001899@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 210

In article <3939159B.3064AD99@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <20000602122713.19467.00000836@nso-md.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>> >In article <20000602043318.18766.00002107@nso-fo.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> >(N2EY)
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >>>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have
>an
>> >>>argument.
>> >>>
>> >>No it doesn't.
>> >>
>> >
>> >Yes, it does!
>>
>> It doesn't.
>
>But you agreed in another posting that anything could remind
>anyone of anything.

I most certainly did not!

> How do you explain the contradiction?

If I'm going to argue with someone, I must take up a contrary position.

73 de Jim, N2EY (a fan of Australian table wines)

211. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603110804.23178.00001900@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 211

In article <3939169D.96D46135@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:
>> >Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)
>> >
>> No. Because no such skit exists.
>
>Ahhhh, but the idea that such a skit exists
>certainly does exist and now it does remind
>me of it.
>--
No it doesn't.

73 de Jim "Bruce" N2EY

212. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39391DBD.6D80072A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 212

Steve Robeson wrote:
> The lack of "youth" in Amateur Radio is a simple matter of lack of
> application and a proliferation of other distractions.

Oh? What's your reference for that fact?

> The
> days of being able to simply infect a youngster with our ability to communicate
> globally with a crystal set and spark gap have passed.

Oh, What's your reference for that fact?

> Kids today need challenges, and those challenges must have some sort of
> practical application.

Oh, What's your reference for that fact?

> Thre's no "elitism" or "generation gap" to it. It's ALWAYS been that way.

Oh? What's your reference for that fact?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
A fool discovers purpose where there is only process.

213. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39391F70.374C6742@IEEE.org>
Source record: 213
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

technocrat wrote:
> When all of the support infrastructure that makes your
> electronic goodies fail, will you be able to communicate with
> anyone about anything? We will!!

Please estimate the odds of such a thing happening.
Do you also live in a cave to avoid meteors?

> I can make a small spark-gap transmitter (better yet, three or
> four spark gap transmitters) from a busted up transistor radio.

Oh dear, we have a ham proposing breaking the law.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

214. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: "Clint \"Rattlehead\"" <rattlehead@computron.net.x>
Message-ID: <393923FB.74A1@computron.net.x>
Source record: 214

Well, the point was, anything can remind anybody of anything... you may not be reminded of it, but somebody else may.

215. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <Er9_4.892$EU3.5576@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 215

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20000603110803.23178.00001899@nso-fz.aol.com...

(Scissors used with great abandon)

73 de Jim, N2EY (a fan of Australian table wines)

Me Too. But out here in the hinterlands all we get is five-liter boxes the Aussies take to the beach to get totalled on. I don't have Cecil's capacity so making the tour and finding the best one is a real challenge. Some of the world's best wine and they use it like Thunderbird. Oh well.

Dick BK

216. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <ev9_4.2852$O35.12199@news3.atl>
Source record: 216

No, not really. But I have a *real* problem with a call that ends in RCA
... : -)

Arnie -
KT4ST

217. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <Kt9_4.894$EU3.4322@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 217

"Clint "Rattlehead"" <rattlehead@computron.net.x> wrote in message
news:393923FB.74A1@computron.net.x...
> Well, the point was, anything can remind anybody of anything... you may
> not be reminded of it, but somebody else may.

And don't none of you nimrods get reminded of the shrink and his dirty
Rorschach tests or I will be reminded of a public horsewhipping.

BK

218. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <393925B8.97303EDD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 218

N2EY wrote:
> There! I've run rings around you logically!

That's great, Jim. If you don't mind, I'll get
my exercise some other way.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

219. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39392661.513CA92B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 219

N2EY wrote:
>
> W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >But you agreed in another posting that anything could remind
> >anyone of anything.
>
> I most certainly did not!

Would you accept proof?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

220. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <39392736.5A2D7340@IEEE.org>
Source record: 220

Arnie Macy wrote:
> No, not really. But I have a *real* problem with a call that ends in RCA
> ... : -)

I can believe that. There's no end to the dirty words
that can be used for 'RCA' phoentics.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

221. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000603120419.05836.00007094@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 221

In article <39391748.BD0487AF@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>Arnie Macy wrote:
>> Since I can't predict where Kim will be operating, I can't avoid those
>> frequencies like I do with 3950 and 14313. So, I think I'll just stay in
>> the CW portion of the bands and tell my 6 year old grandson that her call
>is
>> W5X (the weather lady) should she ever ID in CW.
>
>Speaking of which, do you also object to the callsign W5XXX?
>That's a triple-X rated callsign if I ever say one.
>

Cecil:

W5XXX isn't triple-X rated, it's just triple X! BTW -- if anyone had
such a call sign, and I heard him use the phonetics "Dubbaya Fahaive
Triple Exx," I'd assume his callsign was "W5TX." Of course, it all
depends on how much reverb his echo mic picks up off the back
wall of his trailer!

73 de Larry, K3LT

222. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20000603121003.05836.00007095@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 222

In article <20000603104441.10388.00001804@nso-bk.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>>In article <20000602203213.06864.00002134@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>>>>This reminds me of that Monty Python skit of the guy who wanted to have
>>an
>>>>
>>>>>>argument.
>>>>>>
>>>>>No it doesn't.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Yes, it does!
>>>
>>>It doesn't.
>>>
>>
>>It most assuredly does!
>>
>Is this the 5 minute argument, or the full half hour?
>

How much does the full half hour cost?

73 de Larry, K3LT

223. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kw5tit@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <D619719871880E17.8F62DB77F77F5B70.A9E3BBB46CEEC091@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 223

Oh good grief.... Rings, in this case, imply "twisted."

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim
NCI 3343

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20000603110803.23178.00001898@nso-fz.aol.com...
>
> There! I've run rings around you logically!
>
> 73 de Jim "pining for the fjords" N2EY
>

224. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8hbh750jsc@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 224

In article <20000603110804.23178.00001900@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com says...
>
>In article <3939169D.96D46135@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>> <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:
>>> >Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)
>>> >
>>> No. Because no such skit exists.
>>
>>Ahhhh, but the idea that such a skit exists
>>certainly does exist and now it does remind
>>me of it.
>>--
>No it doesn't.

Yes, it does.

Wait! This isn't an argument! It's contradiction!

I've had enough!

Tom - N8ECW

225. Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <8hbhnc1jsc@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <Oqy6kIVz$GA.328@cpmsnbbsa09>, lak@radio.land.com says...
>
>Well excccccuse me for being soooo dumb!
>
>Just after several decades of observations and having been a flea market
>vendor, this year it seemed to be large percentage than usual. I also noted
>several large flea market vendor whom I have dealt with over the years did
>not attend for the first time in 10 years.
>
>But I forgot this is the internet where personal opinions must tempered by
>considering everyone's point of view and framed up to politically corrected
>to accommodate everyone else on the net.
>
>Next year I will collect evidence in the form of tallies, statements from
>vendor / patrons, etc. to present a more concise and formal report. I will
>form a fact finding committee to explore this situation, and issue position
>paper to congress after 2001 Hamvention, after all a national Icon might be
>in jeopardy! Application for the committe will soon be on-line at
>www.who_could_careless.org/applicationsforcommittee/hamvention/form.html

Why bother? Just think of the net as a big baseball game, and you're the
umpire. As you know, umpires simply call them as they see them, and there's
plenty of Earl Weavers and Billy Martins to argue your call.

Tom - N8ECW

226. Re: DAYTON (it stunk-on-ice)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <39394F22.832FF835@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 226
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

lak wrote:

> But I forgot this is the internet where personal opinions must tempered by
> considering everyone's point of view and framed up to politically corrected
> to accommodate everyone else on the net.
>
> Next year I will collect evidence in the form of tallies, statements from
> vendor / patrons, etc. to present a more concise and formal report. I will
> form a fact finding committee to explore this situation, and issue position
> paper to congress after 2001 Hamvention, after all a national Icon might be
> in jeopardy! Application for the committe will soon be on-line at
> www.who_could_careless.org/applicationsforcommittee/hamvention/form.html

LAK, welcome to rrap. It looks like you're heading in the right direction.

Please be sure that your founding members are elected, even though there are no member to elect them. I know it sounds a little crazy, but that is how things are done here.

You also need to have a constitution and by-laws. Post your membership roster, including names, soc. security numbers, and bank routing numbers so that we may verify actual membership data.

Also, be sure to indicate each member's operating preference, so that if they should claim to be a DXer we may tear them down and stomp on their heads and kick them in the ribs and other vital places. No claim of being a DXer is too small to be overlooked.

Furthermore, we will need a break out of age groups within your committee so as to see if hams really are mostly octagenerians. Be sure to publish something so that we can say you're only interested in the book store aspect of your organization. Lack of a financial report will immediately be met by claims of you running off with the money.

Finally, it is vitally important to determine if your committee members use CW "rarely or never," or "always."

Ooops, almost forgot - two on the group will need sexual preference information. I know, I know, but they really seem to thrive on it.

227. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8hbmoetna1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 227

In article <393881D1.40FA7208@pop3.freewwweb.com>,
p57burke@freewwweb.com wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
>
> > It is very bad manners to show disrespect for the heros of the
> > past...but unfortunately when the accurate facts get reported,
people
> > now tend to get skeptical about everything...even our President's
> > fidelity....which IMHO shows that people have no respect. Yes...
People
> > with bad manners show no respect and people who show no respect have
> > bad manners.
> >
> > 73,
> > Bob Wex w2ilp (I Like Patriots)
> > Did you ever doubt?
>
> Bob, bull. Our president doesn't respect himself, his family, his
office,
> or the people of America. The rest of us are simply waiting for a
change -
> any change.
> 73,
> Brian

Not a CHANGE for the worse I hope. I don't think that any heavy
political debate belongs here...BUT I do think that the hypocritical
right wingers who don't know the difference between sexual intercourse
and blow jobs are not fooling the majority of the American public.

Our president has committed the federal government to funding
programs that will train teachers to be computer literate. This is
needed to give all children the basic training required for them to be
capabile of using a mouse and keyboard. Now if our president had
asked for funds to get all teachers trained to earn Ham licenses and
trained to be able to teach Morse code would that make him more
interested in the education of the American people??? Nope...BECAUSE
as you said most of us have been waiting for the social changes that
will be the result of the technological changes that are now obvious to
most people who have technical backgrounds. Web hope that good (not
bad) results are to be expected when the public adopts the new media in
their every day life....When almost everyone has access to the
INFORMATION HIGHWAY.

Yep...I have to limit my off-topic politics but there are lots of
things that need to be technically considered. When we talk about how
modern technology can be applied to Ham Radio, that is one relevant
topic BUT a greater factor is how Ham Radio can survive. - We must
talk about how Ham Radio can COMPETE with modern commercially available
popular technology. How can we compete with wireless cell phones???
How can we show that Ham Radio has advantages over Internet surfing and
NG chatting???

The Novice Class and the Technician class ham license was
originated in 1951. The reason that they were established was to
combat a relatively new passtime that was taking over the spare time of
Americans (particulary American youth). That was TV viewing. TV was
invented before WW2, but it wasn't until around 1950 that the average
middle class family owned a B&W TV set. By the end of the 50s there
were almost as many TV sets in American households as telephones.
Today we have a greater competitor: - The home PC, which is becomming
more common each year, as PCs become cheaper and easier to operate and
more technically capable. So what do we do??? We simplify and
restructure Ham licensing. We forget about making an entry level class
that will attract youth and test them on what they probably have
learned or will be learning in order to operate their PCs. We reduce
the total number of exam questions and the number of Ham classes to
devaluate the whole educational purpose of the Ham license structure.
We make computer gurus seem even more expert than Extra class Hams
because what they learn makes them more valuable than Hams to academic,
military and commercial real world organizations. In my not so humble
opinion, we have simplified the baby out with the bath water. We have
down played the common basic electronic communication technological
knowledge that applies to both Ham Radio, computer technology and
telecommunication.
In 1951 we created two new classes of license. In 1999 we killed
three classes of licenses. Does that show that we are recognizing our
competition as well as we did in 1951 - today??? No, it shows that Ham
leaders want to down play the technical educational aspects of Ham
Radio in order to upgrade the old Ham appliance operators who are not
interested in learning any new technology and not ready to accept the
challenges the are obviously an outcome of TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE.

The ARRL sent questionaires to Hams, asking their opinions but it
would have been better to ask educators, scientists and even the
general public. The non-Hams wouldn't just be interested in up-grading
themselves. They would be more interested in promoting Ham Radio as
the TECHNICAL HOBBY that it is. Ham Radio is an American legacy that
deserves to be preserved. It can only be preserved if it accepts the
changes that must be made as a result of MODERN TECHNOLOGY.

Hams need MORE license classes,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase License Potential)

A little girl told me that she liked RADIO
more than television because the pictures

were so much more beautiful.
--Joseph Chilton Pierce (Evolution's End)--

Imagine that!
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

228. Re: Ham radio's downward trend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <8hbs26$1a4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 228

In article <20000602095829.14063.00001385@ng-cl1.aol.com>,
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson) wrote:
> >Subject: Re: Ham radio's downward trend
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
> >Date: 06/02/2000 8:19 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <8h8c8k$jqj
>
> >> T.L. Bryant <tlbryant@my-deja.com> took another step toward USENET
history
> by writing in part:
> >> > The question asked time and again is, "Why are there no *young*
newcomers
> to ham radio?" The answer is quite simple: elitism.<<
>
> From this, Bob delved into a lengthy dissertation on the
generation gap.
>
> Neither one of you are correct.

In my opinion all of us are correct. Peoples' motivation is a
complex subject. Motivation in any individual or for any group can be
promoted in various ways and there are many reasons why anyone might
not be enthuastic about any hobby or sport. Especially when such a
hobby or sport has grown out of style.
>
> The lack of "youth" in Amateur Radio is a simple matter of lack
of
> application and a proliferation of other distractions.

Yes in 1951 television viewing was recognized as a DISTRACTION - so
the answer was to create two new classes of license (Novice and
Technician).
Today the use of home PCs and surfing the Information Highway is
recognized as a distraction. So what did they do? They eliminated
three classes of license (Novice, Tech Plus and Advanced)! Simplifying
the license structure may be what old Ham appliance operators want (so
they can easily upgrade) BUT is it what is needed to motivate the youth
of America by showing that they can learn valuable technology that can
apply both to Radio and to digital communication? How can we get
teachers to promote Ham radio to the kids if they are busy teaching
them how to use PCs? The latter is now going to be funded by the
Federal Government because politicians of both major parties are now
committed to promoting the Information Highway. Computers and
everything involved with them is big business. If you break up
Microsoft into Microsoft and Macrohard the whole stock market will be

disrupted! By comparison Kenwood, Yaesu and ICOM are small peanuts.

> We have to "accentuate the positive" and make it more
appealing. The
> days of being able to simply infect a youngster with our ability to
communicate
> globally with a crystal set and spark gap have passed.

We can accentuate the positive BUT today PCs are seen as MORE
POSITIVE than Ham transceivers and more worthy of being accentuated.

> Kids today need challenges, and those challenges must have some
sort of
> practical application.

Yep and learning to be "at home" with computers is becoming a very
popular challenging application that has lots of educational value as
oppossed to Ham Radio, whose leaders say it is not a Technical Hobby.

> Thre's no "elitism" or "generation gap" to it. It's ALWAYS been
that way.
> We just seem to want to forget that every so often and we wind up
reinventing
> the wheel.

We may have to reinvent the wheel for the people who want to use
square wheels because round wheel technology knowledge is not required
on the Ham exams.

> So much wasted time when there's no time to waste at all.

Yep...Thats the truth. It was always true that young men had to
learn how to make a living and still have time to date the girls. This
left only a little time for most to engage in any hobbies that couldn't
satisfy either their quest for economic security or their sexual
needs. Nothing has changed today except that Ham leaders now say that
Ham Radio is not to be a Technical Hobby and a famous "Dilbert" cartoon
insinuates that Ham Radio is not a very sexy hobby either. (sic...It
only gives goose bumps). How can we expect to attract any normal guys
these days???

> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
73,
Hams need MORE license classes,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Incentive License Proponent)

If you want your children to be brilliant,
tell them fairy tales. If you want them
to be very brilliant tell them more
fairy tales.

--Attributed to Albert Einstein--

Hmmm...Is that how we get conditioned to learn? Maybe so...Because people always seem to vote for the politicians who can tell the best fairy tales. People think that I am too technical. I admit that I can't make up any new fairy tales that haven't been read to me by my mother.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

229. Re: call signs???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <PWd_4.1101$EU3.6322@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 229

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20000603110802.23178.00001897@nso-fz.aol.com...
> In article <DQ0_4.685$EU3.3379@newsfeed.slurp.net>, "Appassionata von
Klimax"
> <Pas_von_Kli@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >I am taking my Extra on Saturday and want to have AA5VK to go with my
name.
> >How do I apply for it?
> >
> >Apassionata von Klimax
> >
> Form 695, downloadable from
>
> http://www.fcc.gov
>
> And yes, I get the joke. More Kickapoo Joy Juice, anyone?
>
> 73 de Jim "love those Shmoos" N2EY

If it's a joke it is a blessed old one. I believe Appassionata von Climax (I remember it with the C but I wasn't all that old at the time) was Capp's spoof on Marlene Dietrich. Probably from Destry Rides Again and Ask What the Boys in the Back Room Will Have. Same thing Madelene Kahn did in Blazing Saddles -- I'm Tired. I was always amazed Al Capp got that one thru the Blue Nose Curtain that prevailed at the time.

I came in about the time of General Bullmoose ('Engine Charlie' Wilson, ex-pres of General Motors), Failwell Fatchance (Adlai Stevenson) and right at the end Joanie Phoney (Joan Baez). Capp's pissing contest with the guy that did Dick Tracy gave us Fearless Fosdick.

Won't fight you for the schmoos, Jim, take a Dogpatch Ham any day of the week :=)

230. Re: Behind the scenes in the Walker Household.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <sjiteu6s5ri8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 230

Was it a Joke? Hong's been quite accurate lately.

"Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> wrote:
>Slammed? Well, I guess you could say that. I think it's great! I laughed
>hysterically! I took it as just a really cute joke...and still do. But, no
>matter how you look at it, it's pretty darned funny!
>

231. Re: I feel sorry for TIT's husband.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <sjitsdak5ri108@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 231

Thanks Jim, I'll let Vince know when he get's back in the states.

In article <8h8e41$ob8@nntp.seflin.org>, z005381b@bc.seflin.org (James Rosenthal) wrote:
>
>Vince,
>
>This message is to let you know that some nut is sending messages to the
>r.r.a.p. newsgroup and signing your name to them.

232. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <39397822.7258676D@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 232

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3939169D.96D46135@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:
> >> >Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)
> >> >
> >> No. Because no such skit exists.
> >
> >Ahhhh, but the idea that such a skit exists
> >certainly does exist and now it does remind
> >me of it.
> >--
> No it doesn't.
>
> 73 de Jim "Bruce" N2EY

It exists in the mind of the guy in a rowboat in the desert.

233. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <39397C28.B7E1AF7@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 233

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Cecil:
>
> W5XXX isn't triple-X rated, it's just triple X! BTW -- if anyone had
> such a call sign, and I heard him use the phonetics "Dubbaya Fahaive
> Triple Exx," I'd assume his callsign was "W5TX." Of course, it all
> depends on how much reverb his echo mic picks up off the back
> wall of his trailer!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And I suppose you copy "double yew fahve" as the Philippines (DU5)? You should be well on your way to DXCC.

234. Re: List of the rec.radio newsgroups

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <8hc1os$m4j$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 234
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian Hill <jonnysocko@jps.net> wrote:
>And rec.antiques.radio+phono

That falls under the rec.antiques hierarchy, not the rec.radio hierarchy.

Jeff

235. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: technocrat <jbohanejrNOjbSPAM@juno.com.invalid>
Message-ID: <1629914f.e1bb0f7b@usw-ex0103-086.remarq.com>
Source record: 235
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Hi Tom...

Not talking about legality (spark gap)!!

Talking about functionality in a pinch!

jb

* Sent from RemarQ http://www.remarq.com The Internet's Discussion Network *
The fastest and easiest way to search and participate in Usenet - Free!

236. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: technocrat <jbohanejrNOjbSPAM@juno.com.invalid>
Message-ID: <0b2b8924.e228e8b2@usw-ex0103-086.remarq.com>
Source record: 236
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Cecil,

Again, see response to T.L Bryant. Legality was not the issue!

jb

* Sent from RemarQ http://www.remarq.com The Internet's Discussion Network *
The fastest and easiest way to search and participate in Usenet - Free!

237. Re: call signs???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Appassionata von Klimax <Pas_von_Kli@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <6kh_4.1235$EU3.7269@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 237

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20000603095925.05836.00007032@nso-ch.aol.com...
> In article <DQ0_4.685$EU3.3379@newsfeed.slurp.net>, "Appassionata von
Klimax"
> <Pas_von_Kli@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >
> >I am taking my Extra on Saturday and want to have AA5VK to go with my
name.
> >How do I apply for it?
> >
>
> The VE team, if they have any kind of clue whatsoever, should have
> the Vanity Callsign paperwork available; or you can go to www.fcc.gov
> and follow the links to the ULS, and apply there. AA5VK is currently
> not issued, however it may not be immediately available if someone
> else dropped it for a Vanity call and two years had not passed yet.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Thank you, Larry. You were right about the VE's.

Jim and Richard see below.

I passed today. Coming off the street, I have to wait for the license
before getting the call. No hurry, this is mostly for co-workers anyway.

1. This is my real name and my mother's too. It happened many years ago
when the judge at the divorce hearing suddenly said something like Of course
you will want to change your name. The man's name would still cause you to
throw up. It does come from the Dogpatch cartoon.

2. No I am not a stripper. I am a civil engineer. I do use another name.

3. Yes I have thought of changing it. Not while Mom is still alive.

Thanks again. I expected something more childish.

Pas

238. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3939A715.FC480F94@IEEE.org>
Source record: 238
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

technocrat wrote:
> Again, see response to T.L Bryant. Legality was not the issue!

I'm an Electronics Engineer and I don't know how to
make a spark-gap transmitter out of a transistor radio.
Care to describe how to do it?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

239. Re: call signs???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3939A7AA.CDAD021D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 239

Appassionata von Klimax wrote:
> I passed today. Coming off the street, I have to wait for the license
> before getting the call.

But since you announced the call, ten other hams have decided
they like it and have already applied for it. :-)
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

240. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Glen Quarnstrom <glenq@cyberhighway.net>
Message-ID: <q9cjjso7gduku1am8jov92ssnfke3tpsmj@4ax.com>
Source record: 240
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

>technocrat wrote:
>> Again, see response to T.L Bryant. Legality was not the issue!
>
>I'm an Electronics Engineer and I don't know how to
>make a spark-gap transmitter out of a transistor radio.
>Care to describe how to do it?

Connect two clip leads to the batteries. Connect one clip lead to a
rusty file. Drag the other clip lead over the file in Morse Code
sequence. <grin>

I've heard C.W. transmitters that sounded like they were built that way.
--
glenq@cyberhighway.net
WB7DOW

http://www.cyberhighway.net/~glenq/

241. Wasted Bandwidth/ Kim's Call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Jerry Hooten <jhooten@freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <3939C22C.F323BE37@freewwweb.com>
Source record: 241

Just a thought, Would as bandwidth have been wasted on the group if Kim would have chosen K5BRA instead?

Jerry
KG5RZ

242. Re: an article about manners in USA Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: p57 <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Message-ID: <3939C23F.13E8DA01@pop3.freewwweb.com>
Source record: 242

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:

> In article <393881D1.40FA7208@pop3.freewwweb.com>,
> p57burke@freewwweb.com wrote:
> > Bob, bull. Our president doesn't respect himself, his family, his
> office,
> > or the people of America. The rest of us are simply waiting for a
> change -
> > any change.
> > 73,
> > Brian
>
> Not a CHANGE for the worse I hope.

Yes, even Algore would be a semi-welcome change, unless dead Buddhist nuns are found in a DC park and its ruled a suicide.

> I don't think that any heavy
> political debate belongs here...BUT I do think that the hypocritical
> right wingers who don't know the difference between sexual intercourse
> and blow jobs are not fooling the majority of the American public.

He wasn't asked if he had "sexual intercourse," Bob. He was asked if he has sexual relations of any kind, Bob. Its called oral SEX, Bob. Since it occurred between TWO people, Bob, it was a relation. Burnadette Peters sang a song about making love alone, Bob. Too bad the Prez didn't listen, Bob. A box of Kleenex would have gone over much better than a semen stained dress, Bob. Do you disagree with that, Bob? Larry Roll may be remided of a guy rowing a boat in the desert whenever an airplane flies overhead, but whenever I am offered a cigar I will be reminded of the sickness in the White House, Bob. Or is that hypocritical, too, Bob? He knew they had him and all he had to do was tell the truth, Bob. The truth, Bob. He could have fooled the people with the truth, Bob. It would have been so out of character that no one would have believed him, Bob.

snip

> We make computer gurus seem even more expert than Extra class Hams
> because what they learn makes them more valuable than Hams to academic,
> military and commercial real world organizations. In my not so humble
> opinion, we have simplified the baby out with the bath water. We have
> down played the common basic electronic communication technological
> knowledge that applies to both Ham Radio, computer technology and
> telecommunication.

On .antenna, a one by two ham claimed to have read "several" articles on the "half-square" antenna, which gave dimensions for 80 and 40M. He asked if anyone knew what the dimensions were for 20M. I sure hope he was a 'puter genius, because he sure didn't know the 1st thing about being an Extra. Then a two by two ham asked for instructions for assembling a rg-213 cable with pl-259's. It must be either the 1st of April or its Trick-or-Treat time.

> In 1951 we created two new classes of license. In 1999 we killed
> three classes of licenses. Does that show that we are recognizing our
> competition as well as we did in 1951 - today??? No, it shows that Ham
> leaders want to down play the technical educational aspects of Ham
> Radio in order to upgrade the old Ham appliance operators who are not
> interested in learning any new technology and not ready to accept the
> challenges the are obviously an outcome of TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE.

WHAT? The question pools have gotten ever more technical. The question pool for Extra is a combined Advanced and Extra question pool. Nothing was dumbed down. Dropping fast code is NOT downplaying the technical aspects of the service.

> The ARRL sent questionaires to Hams, asking their opinions but it
> would have been better to ask educators, scientists and even the
> general public.

The FCC asked the American Public for their opinions. I've quit caring what the ARRL does. The last I heard they want to give out CODE certificates to replace those "technical" FCC code exams.

> The non-Hams wouldn't just be interested in up-grading
> themselves. They would be more interested in promoting Ham Radio as
> the TECHNICAL HOBBY that it is. Ham Radio is an American legacy that
> deserves to be preserved. It can only be preserved if it accepts the
> changes that must be made as a result of MODERN TECHNOLOGY.

Helloooo! That's the message that NCI has given out, and all you eyes rolled back, CW Forever types rejected. Now you've reinvented the NCI message and adopted it as your own. Good for you.

243. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: technocrat <jbohanejrNOjbSPAM@juno.com.invalid>
Message-ID: <014dc2c8.6460a698@usw-ex0106-045.remarq.com>
Source record: 243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Cecil....

I'm betting you are a good guy, but I'm also betting that you are baiting me.

If you are an EE, and you don't know how to build a spark-gap transmitter, then I'm sure that I'm not the one you need to be talking to.

See my response to Glen for starters.

Also, remember that in my first post in this topic, and in those posts following the first, I am communicating with someone who relies on the understanding and promise of performance from others rather than on his own technical 'understanding of the concepts' himself.

Again, this is not a question of legality or of polite, logical discuurse. To me, it is a matter of practicality....there are those who "CAN" when it comes to radio wave communication, and those who "CAN'T".

Those who "CAN" are those who understand the art of amateur radio (or, those who understand the technical essence of radio telecommunications in general, for those who like to split hairs), and those who "CAN'T", meaning those who rely on others to provide them communication services, and who have NO idea of how to arrange the same service for themselves should their enablers fail at the task of serving them.

In a nutshell, I am considering those who "talk out of their butts" against those who have the technical saavy to be "CAN DO" operators.

Discussions along any lines other than these are based on a failure to understand my point of departure, and a failure to understand the difference between a technically saavy ham and the qualifications of the intended recipient of my first post.

Basically, discussions along any other lines than these betrays that the dissenting poster didn't understand the difference between the original poster's comments and my response to those comments.

Regards!

JB

* Sent from RemarQ http://www.remarq.com The Internet's Discussion Network *
The fastest and easiest way to search and participate in Usenet - Free!

244. Re: Kim's Callsign

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4st@csam.net>
Message-ID: <y_j_4.3869$j6.22214@news4.atl>
Source record: 244

Don't get my vivid imagination started, Cecil : -)

Arnie -
KT4ST

245. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: technocrat <jbohanejrNOjbSPAM@juno.com.invalid>
Message-ID: <0eaa095c.69be16e7@usw-ex0106-045.remarq.com>
Source record: 245
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

This may be a "duplicate post" of sorts in response to Glen, but
I posted one and did not see it appear. Sorry to have taken
uptoo much space if it (eventually) did appear.

In basics, Glen seems to have the point, or at least he has
responded accordingly, and seems to understand what I am trying
to say.

Best Regards!!

JB

* Sent from RemarQ http://www.remarq.com The Internet's Discussion Network *
The fastest and easiest way to search and participate in Usenet - Free!

246. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3939DA52.356C68B7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 246

N2EY wrote:
> I think you may find the response to my quote quite amusing.

Doubt it. Not my kind of humor.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

247. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3939DB2B.45B09D8A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 247
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

Glen Quarnstrom wrote:
> Connect two clip leads to the batteries. Connect one clip lead to a
> rusty file. Drag the other clip lead over the file in Morse Code
> sequence. <grin>

Well, I know how to do that Glen, but that has nothing
to do with making a spark-gap transmitter out of a
transistor radio.
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

248. Re: Ham Population Dwidling to Nothing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-03 00:00:00 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3939DBFD.13E11F91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner

technocrat wrote:
> If you are an EE, and you don't know how to build a spark-gap
> transmitter, then I'm sure that I'm not the one you need to be
> talking to.

Oh, I know exactly how to build a spark-gap transmitter
just not out of a transistor radio as you said you do.
Exactly what parts in the transistor radio do you use
for the spark-gap transmitter?
--
73, Cecil, W6RCA http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

249. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-04 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603222236.18766.00002369@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 249

In article <393925B8.97303EDD@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> There! I've run rings around you logically!
>
>That's great, Jim. If you don't mind, I'll get
>my exercise some other way.

That's not the correct response, Cecil.

http://www.montypython.net

Look up "Penguin on the Television Set".

I think you may find the response to my quote quite amusing.

(One would think a mensameister with a high IQ would have figured out the
references by now).

73 de Jim "Mrs. Premise" N2EY

250. Re: "Dirty" Words.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2000-06-04 00:00:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20000603222236.18766.00002370@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 250

In article <8hbh750jsc@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.L. Bryant)
writes:

>In article <20000603110804.23178.00001900@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>says...
>>
>>In article <3939169D.96D46135@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>>writes:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>
>>>> <p57burke@pop3.freewwweb.com> writes:
>>>> >Does it remind you of the skit where the nuns wanted to be spanked? ;^)
>>>> >
>>>> No. Because no such skit exists.
>>>
>>>Ahhhh, but the idea that such a skit exists
>>>certainly does exist and now it does remind
>>>me of it.
>>>--
>>No it doesn't.
>
>Yes, it does.
>
>Wait! This isn't an argument!

Yes it is. An argument is a connected series of statements to establish a
proposition. It's not just saying 'No it isn't' ".

> It's contradiction!

No it isn't.
>
>I've had enough!

No you haven't!
>
73 de Jim "BURMA!" N2EY